The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1922 No. 2958

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 303

EDITORIALS:
- The Ship-Subsidy Grab 306
- Judges *vs.* Arbitrators 307
- Youth Is Always Right 307
- In Lieu of the Laureate 308

OUR NAVAL AUTOCRACY IN SAMOA. By Samuel S. Ripley 309

TIMBER MINERS OR TIMBER FARMERS? By Edward Richards 311

THIS STORY IS CALLED: "WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT THE HEATHEN IN MONGOLIA?" By Louis Weitzenkorn 313

JOB-HUNTING IN THE COUNTRY. By a Mechanic 314

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 315

CORRESPONDENCE 316

ARTISAN. By Virginia Woods Mackall 318

THE ROVING CRITIC. By Carl Van Doren 318

BOOKS:
- Marriage. By Havelock Ellis 319
- A Great American. By Oswald Garrison Villard 321
- Consumerism *vs.* Commercialism. By Richard J. Walsh 321
- Heart of Africa. By Phillips Russell 322

DRAMA:
- Shaw and the Theater. By Ludwig Lewisohn 323

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:

Samoa and the United States
- American Law and Order 324
- Samoan Grievances 324
- From the "Loyal" Chiefs 325
- A Counter-Blast 326
- Kind Words from the United States 326
- "To Whom It May Concern" 328

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN
NORMAN THOMAS

ERNEST H. GRUENING, Managing Editor
CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S own survey of his first year as President leads him to feel quite content with his achievements although he bemoans the fact that the drudgery of his twelve months in the most powerful of offices makes him feel as if it had been twenty years instead of one. The great thing, he thinks, is the return to normalcy in the administration of our government and so far as that means a return to constitutional forms of government and lawfulness instead of lawlessness in the administration at Washington he is more than entitled to the credit that he claims, though we are still not without witnessing constant violations of the Constitution by the Executive, as in the matter of Haiti and Santo Domingo. But it cannot be said that in other directions the record of Mr. Harding's first year really connotes statesmanlike achievement, and when we say this we do not overlook the praise he has earned, and the measure of it which his initiative has merited, in the matter of the Washington Conference. But when it comes to statesmanlike dealing with our domestic problems he has made no headway in the twelve months which is worthy of note, and the economic situation of the country is worse in numerous ways. We are still menaced by more tariff grafting, by the ship-subsidy grab, and the soldier bonus, and we are without a constructive program for sane reconstruction.

WHEN he privately surveys the condition of his own party, Mr. Harding cannot feel so very cheerful about the year's results. There is every evidence that there will be the usual swing back to the Democrats in the congressional elections next fall; if he retains a working majority in the House it will only be because of the almost unprecedented size of the present majority. That swing back will not come because the Democrats have any leadership worthy of the name or any alternative program to offer. It will be merely another chapter in the pleasant little American game of jumping from the Republican frying-pan into the Democratic fire and then back again. In certain States the outlook is more than dubious for the Republicans. We venture, for instance, to prophesy that Mr. Beveridge will defeat Senator Harry C. New in the primaries for Republican nomination for Senator in Indiana, but that he will not reach the Senate. In Pennsylvania aggressive and united Democratic leadership if it existed would be able to accomplish a great deal, so disorganized and unhappy is the Republican situation. Certainly a party which sank so low morally as to seat Senator Newberry and cannot present a bold front to raids upon the Treasury should not be surprised if it faces a reversal of the verdict of 1920. As for the Democracy, there are more than a few indications that Henry Ford's is today the only name to conjure with for the Presidential nomination, Mr. McAdoo and John W. Davis being now out of the running, and that a campaign of fiat money looms upon the horizon.

AS we go to press the condition of the Four-Power Treaty is reported to be "desperate"—which is certainly not bad news. The Yap Treaty slipped through without trouble, but those Senators who take their duties seriously are not going to let this treaty pass if they can help it until they have had all possible light shed upon it and have studied it in all its ramifications. That is, of course, a species of treason in the eyes of those who feel that it is the duty of Senators not to reason why but to do as the Executive tells them without question. Senator Borah is naturally particularly trying. He actually wants to know if this treaty will have any effect upon the Lansing-Ishii Agreement. Senator Underwood and Senator Lodge insist that the treaty abrogates that and all similar agreements, but when they are put to it to cite their proofs they are unable to produce anything to support their contention. So we are to have public opinion aroused once more to bring the Senate to heel. The League-of-Nations crowd is organizing to make the Senators do what it wishes. We can only hope that before this issue of *The Nation* appears the treaty will either have been put into language that is clear and explicit and adequately limited or that it will have been decisively defeated. In the latter case any attempt to blame the Senate will fail; the responsibility will rest where it belongs—with the treaty-makers who are not equal to the undertaking. A peaceful understanding with Japan did not require a virtual alliance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POINCARE'S advent seems to have been taken as a signal for swashbuckling all across Europe. Italian Fascisti have again seized Fiume; Polish adventurers still hold Vilna, and the Polish Government which hesitated to announce annexation of Vilna has fallen. The British diehards are rattling their swords again and shaking rather impotent fists at that prince of compromisers, David Lloyd-George. In Ireland the extremest military Republicans are on the warpath again. The Genoa Conference looks like a faded shadow of the bright picture Lloyd-George painted. All of which proves, not that Europe is headed for immediate perdition, but that one conference no more makes peace than one swallow makes a summer.

SEVERAL judges have been making uncomplimentary remarks about juries. After an acquittal in New York City the presiding judge publicly denounced the finding as a "disgraceful verdict" and ordered the names of the jurymen removed from the official list. It is a pity that one of the jurymen did not rise in court, denounce the judge's words as a "disgraceful opinion," and remind him that he had no more right to browbeat them for their finding on the facts than they would have had to criticize his rulings on law. Furthermore, somebody ought to tell our magistrates—if they have not yet glimpsed the fact—that there is a hundred times more dissatisfaction with our judge-system than with our jury-system. Taking the jury-system by and large, it is one of the conspicuous and continuing successes of a governmental fabric much of the rest of which has long been an anachronism. One suggestion in regard to juries from a New York judge, however, is worth repeating. Judge Alfred J. Talley is right when he says that too many of our most intelligent citizens are exempted from jury duty, thus lowering the caliber of the panels selected. He suggests that there be no exemptions by classes—that no one be excused but for personal reasons deemed sufficient by the judge.

"GREAT BRITAIN Terminates Rule in Egypt—Lloyd George Announces Decision for Abandonment of the Protectorate—Premier Says New Offer Will Permit Country to Set Up Own Institutions"—so run the headlines on Lloyd George's latest proposition for an Egyptian settlement. Reading further, however, we learn that "four questions are absolutely reserved to the discretion of the British Government: (1) Security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt; (2) defense of Egypt against all foreign aggression or interference, direct or indirect; (3) protection of the foreign interests of Egypt and protection of minorities; (4) until an agreement satisfactory to our selves [England] and to the Egyptian Government has been concluded the status quo will remain intact." These reservations are, of course, almost precisely the reservations that Zaghlul and Adly refused, and destroy the heart of any nominal independence England might grant. What they, taken together with the American headlines, really prove, is that the British are abler propagandists than we. They make America believe that the Same Old Stuff is the New Freedom. President Harding might learn from them; the next time he sends a general back to Haiti he might announce it thus: President Harding Gives Haitians Full Freedom—Sends General Russell to Island with Entire Control of Civil and Military Affairs—Haitians Free to Select Flowers for Flower-beds, Pictures for Homes, and Hats Worn on Streets—Islanders Acclaim American Generosity.

"HIGH Commissioner with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary." This title was conferred by the President on Brigadier General John H. Russell, who has left for Haiti where he is to have "plenary authority over all the affairs of the country, both civil and military . . . and of the United States Legation . . . as well as the native appointees, and including the collector of customs, financial adviser, sanitary and public health officers." As the appointment is without precedent in American history, both in the creation of the office of High Commissioner over a technically still free and independent nation and in the failure to send the appointment to the Senate for confirmation, a resolution of inquiry was introduced by Senator Walsh of Montana. In reply President Harding sent a copy of Ambassador Russell's commission, adding "that it would not be compatible with the public interest" to make public his instructions. Among them, *The Nation* has good reason to believe, are orders to put through the loan which the State Department and the bankers are trying to fasten on Haiti—which will serve to copper-rivet the Occupation on the Haitian people for at least forty years—in other words in perpetuity. A resolution challenging the constitutionality of General Russell's appointment was introduced by Senator King following the receipt of President Harding's response, and was referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

TO one who has followed the Haitian mess with its alternations of force and fraud one violation of the Constitution more or less is not astonishing. Of General Russell's personal disqualifications for any Haitian post *The Nation* has already spoken. President Harding, of course, swamped with other duties, has no first-hand information on Haitian and Dominican affairs. Before long, however, we hope that he may be so informed and reminded of his specific campaign pledges. On August 28, 1920, speaking from the front porch at Marion, he said:

> So many things have been done by the present expiring Administration that no power on earth could induce me to do that I cannot even recount them. I may remark casually, however, that if I should be, as I fully expect to be, elected President of this just and honorable Republic, I will not empower an Assistant Secretary of Navy to draft a constitution for helpless neighbors in the West Indies and jam it down their throats at the point of bayonets borne by the United States marines. We have a higher service for our gallant marines than that. Nor will I misuse the power of the Executive to cover with a veil of secrecy repeated acts of unwarranted interference in domestic affairs of the little republics of the Western Hemisphere, such as in the last few years have not only made enemies of those who should be our friends, but have rightfully discredited our country as their trusted neighbor.

General Russell, dictator of Haiti without the consent of the Senate, is the officer who jammed down the illegal constitution at the point of bayonets borne by United States marines. And when the Senate asks for light on another act of unwarranted interference in that little republic, the Executive covers this act "with a veil of secrecy."

PRESIDENT HARDING'S refusal to act seems to leave nothing for it but a Congressional investigation of the charges made on the floor of the House against E. Mont Reily, Governor of Porto Rico. There is no doubt that Governor Reily has acted contrary to the wishes of the majority in the Porto Rican Senate or that he has brought about a deadlock which has practically stopped the wheels of government on the island. He has also succeeded in stirring up

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-American bitterness where none existed before. His opponents demand at most a "free state" with powers far less than those granted Ireland by the English. The real problem that unfortunately too few Porto Ricans or Americans have considered is economic. Porto Rico, a rich island with an equable climate, under the dominion of the planters, cannot furnish the workers who raise sugar cane with sugar to sweeten their coffee. We hope that any investigation undertaken will not confine itself strictly to political charges, but will deal with the inexcusable economic tragedy now being enacted on the island.

IF a man's name is Nicolai Mansevitch and special agents of the Department of Justice charge him with having radical literature in his possession, according to all bureaucratic logic there is only one thing to do and that is to deport him. Defense is superfluous; that deportation would separate the victim from his wife and three American-born children and exile him—a Russian—to what is now a Polish city is irrelevant. So reasoned the representatives of the Department of Labor in Detroit. And then something happened. The Detroit *News* and four "respectable" attorneys took up the case with the result that it is now under review at Washington. The attorneys have said the sort of things which unpopular believers in justice even for Russians have been saying about similar proceedings for a long time. The deportation decree, the attorneys allege, could stand in no court of record. The immigration inspectors even forbade cross-examination of the agents who accused Mansevitch on the ground that it threatened "to embarrass the Government" by revealing the identity of some of its agents. Here is evidence of a revival of American opposition to star-chamber justice which does credit to Detroit.

TWICE expelled by the New York Legislature for the crime of Socialism, August Claessens has recently been seated by that body in place of the Democrat who was elected on the face of the returns in the 1921 elections. Mr. Claessens charged fraud and demanded an investigation. The judiciary committee, to whom the matter was referred, acted with commendable promptness, and reported that an honest count showed a victory for Claessens by a plurality of more than 400. The legislature adopted the report and sidetracked a motion to expel Claessens. The result is gratifying as evidence of New York State's recovery from the anti-red hysteria. It shows also that there are limits to vote-stealing which even New York politicians will in normal times respect. There is still a long way to go before Socialists or any other minority group will be assured a fair chance at the New York polls by the bipartisan ring in control of elections. In several districts the Socialists get credited not with the number of votes cast for them but only with those that the election officials are afraid not to count. The use of voting machines in New York City—which this legislature may authorize—will reduce the element of fraud if not of intimidation. The opposition of Tammany members of the legislature to their use is an argument for them.

THE French Government is at last keeping its promise to reduce the period of compulsory military service from two years to one and a half. This would bring the army to about 435,000 white Frenchmen, with 115,000 North Africans and as many Negro troops. This army is widely scattered: France maintains 85,000 men in Morocco, 65,000 in Algeria, Tunis, and Cochin-China, 7,000 at Constantinople, 50,000 in Syria, 8,000 in the Saar Basin (where, according to the Treaty of Versailles, "only a local gendarmerie for the maintenance of order may be established"), 90,000 on the Rhine, 500 in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Rumania, and 800 in plebiscite zones (Memel, Silesia, etc.)—a truly imperial army far-flung across the map. All this, of course, has inevitable bearing upon the question of Allied debts; good American senators cannot help reflecting upon it when they hear French statesmen plead their poverty. But the French army is more than large: it is militarizing a hitherto pacific race. It is importing the military habit of mind, military vices, and military diseases into the heart of Africa; and in imposing its black army, virtually a slave legion, on the Rhineland, it is fanning race hatred the world over. The consequence of this militarization of Africa only future generations can tell.

THE reports coming almost simultaneously of the successful advance of the Far Eastern Republic's army and of Chita's capitulation to Japanese demands at Dairen are irreconcilable. After struggling against desperate odds for four years for the establishment of an independent democracy in Siberia, the Far Eastern Republic is unlikely to agree to terms whose object is to make her an economic vassal of Japan—particularly when the White Army has been pushed back nearly to Vladivostok. The Siberian Delegation at Washington has received an official denial from its Government of all reports that it has yielded to Japan. Meanwhile it should be kept in mind by Americans that the Chita Government is fighting not only for its own right to exist as an independent state but for the rights of all foreigners on its territory to trade and to share equally in the development of the country. Americans whose goods, shipped under Japanese "protection," have been left stranded on sidings along the reaches of the Siberian and the Chinese Eastern railways know what Japanese control means to the future of the open door in the Russian Far East.

WEEP, tamers and traders of horses! The laws are upon your track. Fiats and verdicts darken the sky. Caveat emptor is fallen. Justice Cropsey in Brooklyn has awarded to the purchaser of Playfellow, brother of Man o' War, the $100,000 purchase price recently given for him—all because Playfellow was a "wind-sucker." The learned justice, indeed, draws distinctions. The seller of a horse need not tell all he knows about the creature; yet what he actually tells must be the truth. David Harum would possibly have been within this law when he said that his incorrigibly balky horse would stand without hitching. Yet what avenues of interference with an ancient occupation the verdict opens up. Who now, having mixed gunpowder in his horse's oats, can speak with the old certainty about his horse's fiery nature? Who now, having temporarily smothered his horse's heaves, can hint that the beast is sound in wind and limb? What now about equine teeth manhandled and manes and tails dyed as a disguise for age? How can subtle treatment of splint or spavin or wind-gall still thrive if courts discourage it? Blue and bluer grow our laws and lives. Before we know it some oppressive statute will demand that poker be played with peas, that banks be robbed only of counterfeit money, and men be murdered with none but blank cartridges.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ship-Subsidy Grab

A GRAB pure and simple; another raid upon the Treasury; the creation of another privileged class in America—this is what President Harding calls for in his subsidy message, as misleading in its reasoning as fallacious in its economics. It asks Congress to decide, in the worst depression in the history of shipping, that Americans cannot compete profitably with other nations on the high seas and that, therefore, the Government must go into partnership with them to the extent of guaranteeing them against loss and insuring them a profit up to 10 per cent. The President holds it to be so vital, for various reasons, that our flag should be on the seas that he would have Congress pledge the sum of $32,000,000 annually to keep in service ships for which there is no economic justification. To bring this about, the President, having abandoned the originally suggested plan of special subsidies for special voyages, not only asks for a direct subsidy of about $30,000,000 a year, but also for the payment of $3,000,000 a year to officers and crews as annual compensation for enrolment in the Naval Reserve, and for an authorization allowing shippers to deduct from the amount of their income tax 5 per cent of the freight moneys paid by them to American ships, allowing a higher depreciation charge on vessels in connection with the income tax and various other special legislative favors, including the discontinuance of the army and navy transport services. Worst of all is the proposal that at least 50 per cent of the immigrants from maritime countries and all from non-maritime countries must come in American vessels—a proposal certain to react upon the United States and to lead to serious retaliations by the nations affected.

Now *The Nation* yields to no one in the ardor of its desire to see the American flag in all the ports of the world, but if this is the only way that it can be achieved it would greatly prefer a return to ante-bellum conditions. Opposed as it has been to government ownership and operation of ships, it would far rather see that policy adopted than the one Mr. Harding proposes. For a subsidy is never anything else than a premium upon incompetency and inefficiency, and a source of corruption—one of the worst scandals in our history is the story of the Pacific Mail Steamship frauds in the seventies. It means the partial endowment of a business which, if Mr. Harding speaks truly, cannot stand upon its own feet. For that endowment the tax-payers will receive nothing but the satisfaction which may come from knowing that their flag flies on many vessels. Economic advantage there will be none; not even the most rabid defender of the subsidy will seriously contend that the country's export or import trade is affected, or ever has been affected, by the flag that flies over the bottoms in which goods come and go. Looking at the problem from the point of view of all the world, it is to its advantage that the trade of all countries be carried on in the most efficient and economical method possible by those able to handle it cheapest. The only sound reason for urging that there be American ships under our flag is, therefore, that their manning offers an outlet for American manhood and American enterprise and that Americans are as capable today of obtaining without government aid their fair share of the world's traffic as they were from 1840 to 1860 when our ships were among the leaders on the Seven Seas.

Indeed, *The Nation* believes so profoundly in the latent skill and energy of Americans, and has such an abiding faith in their adaptability and enterprise that it declines to believe that they are neither as able nor as efficient as the Germans, or the Norwegians, or the British. Despite what has been said to the contrary, the Germans built up their great fleets without important aid from their government; the oft-repeated story that they were aided by preferential railroad rates has only the flimsiest basis. Without any government aid today they are reviving their shipping with astonishing speed and vigor, helped, it is true, by the low stand of the mark, but correspondingly handicapped by the high cost of everything they have to import, whether for ship-building or general business. The British built up their vast fleet with slight government mail payments; their chief asset is the extraordinary technical skill and knowledge acquired by centuries of seafaring and the same is largely true of the Norwegians. Hence we resent the Harding proposals as stamping our countrymen at once as inferior to almost every other maritime nation, as men who can only conquer the seas with the aid of government pap. We are well aware, of course, of every argument advanced against our position—notably those based upon the low wages paid to Japanese and German and Norwegian sailors. Every one of them would have been as valid in 1850 when our ships were more than holding their own by superior speed and by the greater cleverness and business ability of captains and supercargoes.

Yankee wits went to the front then. If Mr. Harding's plan is adopted by Congress there will be nothing whatever to induce the Yankee shipowner and captain to use their brains; year in, year out they will operate their vessels with the deadening consciousness that however much money they may lose the government assures them a profit. How long would any similar proposal in regard to our railroads last if Mr. Harding were to advance it? No; if putting the Treasury into partnership with the shipowners is the only way out, let us dispense with the ships we now have and let us begin to start again on a sound economic basis with all proper encouragement to skill, thrift, and initiative.

We admit, of course, that the present situation is unique in that the country is facing a terrible loss in the handling or disposal of its ships. But the creation of a great fleet all at once was a war measure and did not proceed gradually with due regard to economic or trade needs; it was like gridironing a new State with railroads in every direction and then throwing the State open to settlement and expecting the roads to be fully used. The fact that the war compelled this costly creation of a fleet with staggering losses is no reason whatever why we should embark upon a further policy which is economically indefensible—especially as the almost unbelievable waste and extravagance if not corruption of the management of the fleet until its present directors took hold is the clearest kind of warning of what we may expect if politics, business, and government strike hands in the shipping trade. The only defensible argument the President has is the necessity of a fleet as a reserve in case of war, but with what grace does that come from the man who has been urging naval disarmament and who so solemnly declared at Arlington that war must never come again?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judges *vs.* Arbitrators

WHEN Kenesaw Mountain Landis, fortunately judge no longer, took time between jobs as Federal judge and as baseball pooh-bah to settle the Chicago building trades controversy he was hailed as a Daniel come to judgment. But his decision angered labor and has required a lot of enforcing from citizens' committees and others. Besides reducing wages and eliminating certain wasteful practices he reintroduced elaborate wage classifications of skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers which are not in line with a sound labor policy. More recently, when Judge Martin T. Manton of New York, acting as arbitrator, decided a long-standing dispute between newspaper publishers and pressmen, a strike was narrowly averted by pleas to the honor of the workers who were already pledged to accept the arbitrator's decision. The union will make every effort to reopen the question. In both these cases, as in many others, the trouble, we believe, lies deeper than the unreasonableness so often alleged against labor or the inherent difficulties of the situation. Arbitration has won sullen acquiescence rather than consent from the men because the arbitrators have conceived themselves as judges applying a priori principles evolved from their own inner consciousness or from their legal training rather than from a study of the situation. Here, for instance, is Judge Manton's wisdom on employers and employees:

> A clear statement defining an employer and employee is useful. An "employer" is one who uses or engages the services of another for pay. The employer is deemed to have superior choice, control, and direction of an employee and the employee represents his will, not merely in the ultimate result of the work, but in the details. The "employee" is one who engages in the performance of the proper duties assigned to him by his employer and contracts to do so for pay. He labors for the pleasure or interest of another. His duties should be defined and directed by his employer. The purpose and thought should be to increase the quantity and quality of work and add productivity inuring to the general wealth of mankind.

Acting on this principle the judge has with one stroke swept away customs and practices which have been established in newspaper pressrooms for twenty-five or thirty years. Although it makes no direct reduction in wage scales the union claims that the decision means a 35-per-cent cut in annual earnings of its members and, for 500 men, the loss of their jobs. Judge Manton has decided that the publisher has the sole right to determine the number of men on the presses. This had previously been determined by unreasonable orders of the union. Judge Manton has decreed eight instead of six hours for night work. He has further ordered a cut in over-time wages, and the elimination of any control by the union over the transfer of men from one press to another and over press-room foremen.

In a word, Judge Manton has now restored the former relationship between the publisher and the pressroom force. Hitherto the workers, through their union, have had some share in the management of the plant. We are free to confess that the union's part in shop control was not always exercised in the best interest of the industry as a whole. But the essential point is that a certain amount of joint control over the pressroom had been worked out in the long period of dealings between the publishers and the union, and that Judge Manton, an outsider in the newspaper world, put an end to this control.

It would be natural to suppose that a man in such a position would not have the temerity to effect sweeping and drastic changes in a delicate and complicated machine without exhaustive study of the conditions of the industry. But, apparently, such is far from the fact. He has simply applied the preconceived opinion we have already quoted. Judge Manton as arbitrator acted like Judge Manton as judge. He was concerned primarily with the question of the guilt of the parties rather than with the sort of a settlement necessary to achieve peace and well-being in the industry. He reached his conclusion not by a study of the stresses and strains of the economic and human factors of a modern pressroom but by the imposition of an abstract legal principle into the complexities of a real situation. The results are, as might be expected, devastating. It is impossible to foretell what the outcome will be. For the present there is far more unrest and ill-feeling in the pressrooms than before the case came up, and the radical opponents of arbitration in the labor movement have another argument to hand. It is to be doubted whether peace with such complete victory for one side is a practical possibility even in a pressroom. One thing, however, is clear. It is impossible to bring law and order into an industry by crying guilty at several thousand men—no matter how guilty they may be. Industrial arbitration is essentially a political problem, and like all political problems nowadays it is rooted in economics and in industrial engineering. If arbitration is to survive as a method of settling industrial disputes there must be more statesmen as arbitrators—statesmen who know economics and the processes of industry and have more than a purely legalistic point of view.

Youth Is Always Right

THE keenest intelligence in the British Isles has recently uttered what is perhaps its keenest observation. The intelligence is, of course, Bernard Shaw's. The observation is that if a great teacher of his age has done all he ought to do he must expect, and he should desire, to come in time to seem outmoded, superfluous, even something of a nuisance. Thinking, Mr. Shaw perceives, is in this respect like walking: once the habit has been acquired the learner has to practice it alone. As he cannot be precisely the same person his teacher was, he must go by different paths to different goals. Indeed, the measure of the valuable teacher of thinking is his power to show his pupils how they may reach conclusions he himself never could reach. After Socrates, Plato; after Plato, Aristotle. It calls, indeed, for an almost inhuman degree of magnanimity to rejoice when we see ourselves distanced by those whom we first set upon their feet; Mr. Shaw's attitude of willingness, even of eagerness, is a sign of that capacity for elevated vision which has lent wings to his words and barbs to his truth. But his prompt admission of a thing which his mind lets him see is only what he has taught his followers, and his age, to expect of him. No matter if it does not flatter his pride. He does not have that kind of pride by the exercise of which a man would rather be president than be right. He knows that the life of thought depends not upon the fidelity with which it continues in one direction but in the vitality with which it stirs successive generations.

For thinking is part of the human process no less than play or work or love or aspiration. Its roots are in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protoplasm and its nourishment comes from living growth. To look back over the long and jagged history of opinion is to discover that opinions rise and fall but that only the making and testing of opinion go on forever; and it is to discover that opinion has always prospered most when it was most nearly allied with the creative forces of youth. Perhaps one should hardly call it opinion at all when those who cherish it are following it in full pursuit. Perhaps then it is instinct and little more. But the instincts of youth are precious as nothing else is precious. Youth, viewed broadly, is always right.

Viewed thus broadly, conservatism is the element of death and radicalism is the element of life. The human tribe, straggling through the wilderness of the world, perpetuates itself by begetting and bearing its young, who, at first protected by bosom and counsel, eventually detach themselves and move toward the front while their parents gradually slip toward the rear and are left behind. The process is cruel but it is real; and it is irresistible. What other course, after all, is there to take? Who knows where we come from or where we are going to? If youth has now and then plunged blindly along blind roads, so has age wrought incalculable evil by inquisitions and oppressions aimed to check the march of mankind in its natural advance. Experience grows cynical and lags heavily back, scorning the impulse to create. Youth staggers under the burden of freeing itself, as if it were not enough to perform the hard tasks and fight the bitter battles which the old men of the tribe "wish" upon it. No wonder high hearts falter under their fate when they do not rebel; no wonder they grow old so soon and take up the immemorial complaint; no wonder the youth of any particular generation always does so little. It is right but it is in the minority.

Fortunately years alone are not the final evidence of youth or age. Always there are wise men who, like Socrates or Goethe in their days, or like Bernard Shaw or Anatole France in ours, refuse to grow old as the seasons increase upon them. They put forth new leaves, they unfold new blossoms, with a continuous rejuvenescence. They are the links between young and old. Through their intercession youth grows conscious of the meaning of its urges, as it is already conscious of its essential rightness. Through their interpretation age is reminded of what, left alone, it would always forget: the generous intentions and the authentic power of youth. They are the true spiritual parents of the race. Yet what they do is no more than what all parents do who are not jealous of their children. They watch them at their wild games with joy that they are so strong. They offer advice which, they hope, may save them the experience of unnecessary pain and may help them to realize their potentialities, but they do not feel too much chagrin when the advice is slighted, knowing that wisdom is incommunicable and must be learned over again in person by each new apprentice to life. Alas that there are so few good or wise parents! It is the fault of the bad and the unwise if they find youth wilful, heedless, insolent. They have fixed their eyes upon individuals who go astray and not upon the larger drift in which life is perpetually renewed. Is life itself good or bad? There are, it is true, divergent answers to the question, but few are better than that of E. W. Howe, who says: "We have it, and must make the best of it. And as long as we do not blow our brains out, we have decided life is worth living." At least life is best where it is most vivid—in the heart and ways of youth.

In Lieu of the Laureate

WE are distressed to see that the Poet Laureate has failed to produce an official ode for the British royal wedding. We are so distressed that we hardly know whether to rummage through the archives of the Hanoverians for a substitute manufactured for some earlier occasion or to manufacture a new article ourselves. But let learning and poetry both serve us, with the aid of E. K. Broadus's agreeable new study of "The Laureateship" (Oxford).

Here, for instance, is a part of what the elegant Henry James Pye, George III's laureate, wrote when the Princess Charlotta Matilda of England married Prince Frederick William of Stuttgart:

> Awhile the frowning Lord of arms
> Shall yield to gentler Pow'rs the plain;
> Lo! Britain greets the milder charms
> Of Cytherea's reign.
> Mute is the trumpet's brazen throat,
> And the sweet flute's melodious note
> Floats on the soft ambrosial gale;
> The sportive Loves and Graces round,
> Beating with jocund step the ground,
> Th' auspicious nuptials hail!
> The Muses cease to weave the wreath of war,
> But hang their roseate flow'rs on Hymen's golden car!

Or if this seems a shade heroic and a little old-fashioned, here are certain lines of Tennyson on the marriage of Princess Beatrice to Prince Henry of Battenberg:

> The Mother weeps
> At that white funeral of the single life,
> Her maiden daughter's marriage; and her tears
> Are half of pleasure, half of pain—the child
> Is happy—even in leaving *her!*

And yet that seems to us to have a touch of insinuation that we should be the last to intend—though Tennyson cannot have meant it. Let us turn instead to Thomas Warton and his admirable compliments to a king with the same name as that of the present husband of England's queen:

> Lo! the fam'd isle, which hails thy chosen sway,
> What fertile fields her temperate suns display!
> Where Property secures the conscious swain,
> And guards, while Plenty gives, the golden grain. . . .
> These are Britannia's praises. Feign to trace
> With rapt reflections Freedom's favorite race!
> But though the generous isle, in arts and arms
> Thus stands supreme, in Nature's choicest charms;
> Though George and Conquest guard her sea-girt throne
> One happier blessing still she calls her own—

and that happier blessing was of course the bride.

We find ourselves coming back to the bride, as one does when mortals are married. Here suddenly the homely muse of one of our republican poets overtakes us:

> This George and Mary Windsor must have lots of sense as well as dust, to let their only daughter marry a man who is quite ordinary—a man at least who never had as good a start in life as dad, but is a boy of their own town, grew up there and there settles down. Well, that is how it ought to be, and if he sticks to business he will thrive and prosper till he may stand before kings and queens some day. And what if the new couple have to work and plan and scrimp and save a few years till they make their pile and can put on a better style? If they attempt it nothing loth it will be better for them both. Then hail the bridegroom and the bride! Let the nuptial knot be tied! Whatever others may prefer, her for him and him for her!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Naval Autocracy in Samoa

By SAMUEL S. RIPLEY

In the last two years The Nation *has shown how American imperialism, with its mailed fist, has invaded the Caribbean. The story below, with accompanying documentary material in the International Relations Section, shows that the same system has reached out into the Pacific. We present at this time a personal story and opinion. Later we shall take up other aspects of the American occupation of Samoa, including a statement by the Navy Department in defense of its attitude and administration.*

I WAS born on the island of Tutuila, Samoa, where my mother and my father, an American citizen, now reside with several members of the immediate family. Both individually and collectively we have property interests of some value in the Samoan Islands. I left Samoa as a youth in 1904, going first to Hawaii and later to California, where I have since lived, except for the period of my enlistment during the war. Shortly after I returned from overseas, my parents urgently requested me to visit Samoa to help in private business. For this purpose my wife and I left San Francisco for Samoa in June, 1920, ignorant of any naval controversies respecting the conduct of Samoan affairs or of any injustices perpetrated upon the Samoans.

However, shortly after reaching Samoa, we were informed that the Samoan people were enduring many abuses at the hands of the naval officers and appointees sent from the United States. The grievances of the Samoans ranged from personal outrages to serious charges of governmental and financial mismanagement. Contrary to general belief, the United States has no proprietary interests in the Samoan Islands. The Samoans are the owners of the soil and have always maintained their own government, which has been recognized by the United States, Great Britain, and Germany in various solemn treaties. The governing body under the Samoan system of government is an assembly of all the chiefs, called the Fono, who in so-called American Samoa number about 400. The Navy officials sent to Samoa, however, have gradually come to assume that they have the right to govern the Samoan people autocratically and to administer all the civil affairs of the Samoan Government.

Shortly after our arrival, the Naval Commandant then stationed at Samoa refused to allow the Fono to meet, since each time it convened the chiefs demanded an accounting of funds collected from the Samoans in taxes, of the customs fund of the Samoan Government, and of various Samoan public funds. And the Commandant did this, in spite of the fact that the Codification of the Rules and Regulations for the Government of American Samoa, issued by the naval commandants at Samoa, specifically states "That the councils consisting of the hereditary chiefs shall retain their own form or forms of meeting together," and that the customs of the Samoans shall be preserved. The Fono, not wishing open conflict with the Commandant, supported as he was by armed force, did dissolve, but not until it had appointed a committee with full power to act in all matters for the Samoan Government. Finally, in July, the chiefs, feeling that they had exhausted every hope of relief from the Navy officials then stationed in Samoa, addressed a written petition to Josephus Daniels, then Secretary of the Navy, and besought President Wilson for help by radio. But not even the courtesy of an acknowledgment was vouchsafed.

When I had been reliably informed of the wrongs perpetrated upon the Samoan people I advised them to be patient and asked for a full, fair statement of their grievances, which I received with the understanding that they were to be properly compiled and presented to the President and various interested departments of government, unless the Navy Department was able and willing to right the injustice and iniquity. Having accomplished all possible in our private matters, my wife and I departed from Samoa at the end of September, 1920.

The following November, after charges had been preferred by a naval officer concerning the scandalous maladministration of Samoan affairs, the Navy Department held a court of inquiry in Samoa. The Commandant, after receiving the election returns and knowing that the Administration would change, assumed that the board would really investigate and committed suicide; but he made a fatal mistake since it applied copious coats of whitewash to the blackest spots. No testimony was accepted unfavorable to the naval officials involved by the charges, and no inquiry whatever was made into the grievances and demands of the Samoan Government and people. For instance, this court announced "There is no evidence of financial dishonesty," meaning that the court refused to accept any evidence to that effect, since for some reason not stated the naval auditing board audited the books of the Samoan Government for only the last two months out of a period of more than twenty years in which no public audit had been made of the naval handling of Samoan funds. The president of this court of inquiry, Captain Waldo Evans, U.S.N., was made the new Commandant at Samoa.

After the Navy Department had thus showed its attitude and the committee of chiefs had advised me that there was no amelioration of conditions, I secured the services of an attorney, Mr. C. S. Hannum, to assist in compiling the grievances of the Samoan people and to present the matter to the proper authorities in Washington, both of us agreeing that it was useless to attempt anything until after a change in Administration. The compiled statement of grievances [p. 324] was prepared and transmitted to the committee of chiefs for their sanction and approval, which were heartily given; they also unanimously agreed on the selection of Mr. Hannum as their attorney and gave me full power and authority to represent the Samoan Government in all matters between it and the United States.

Early in April, 1921, Mr. Hannum accordingly went to Washington and presented Samoan matters and the compiled statement signed by me as the properly constituted representative of the Samoan Government, to the President, the State Department, the Navy Department, the Agricultural Department, and the Bureau of Education of the Department of the Interior, as well as to the proper committees of Congress. As a result of his efforts the Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby, wrote in May: "Permit me to assure you that this Department does, indeed, entertain a sincere and abiding interest in the progress and welfare of the Samoan people, and is even now giving their affairs very

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full consideration." Accepting this assurance as adequate, Mr. Hannum thereupon left Washington, returned to California, and made a report to me, expressing implicit confidence in the statements of the Secretary of the Navy and calling attention to orders sent to the Commandant at Samoa to make a full investigation of all matters in the compiled statement and report to the Department fully with recommendations leading to improvements. Mr. Hannum also advised me that I should go to Samoa on the next steamer not only to attend to private matters but to convey his report and the assurances of the Secretary of the Navy personally to the patient and long-suffering chiefs and people of Samoa. I addressed a personal letter of thanks to the Secretary of the Navy for his assurances, and advised him of my intention to depart for Samoa and of my purposes in going; I asked that I should not be interfered with in pursuing these objects, assuring him that I would not interfere with any naval affairs of the Islands. To this the Secretary of the Navy replied, stating among other things: "This Department does not anticipate that there will be any molestation in any manner by government officials," and expressed no objection to my mission. I therefore sailed for Samoa on August 2, 1921, by the steamship Sonoma.

Before reaching Samoa I was presented with an identification certificate to fill out and advised that to land at Samoa I must deposit $100. I complied with the requirements and upon arriving at Pago Pago, August 15, a naval officer came aboard, took my identification certificate and deposit, and left the vessel while I prepared to go ashore. As I started down the gangplank this officer informed me that the commandant, Captain Waldo Evans, desired my presence at once and thereupon led me by a round-about way, not by the street, to his office. I requested permission to have a witness accompany me, but my request was not granted. When we reached the office, Captain Evans said: "Mr. Ripley, I am sorry to see you here. I knew before you left San Francisco that you were coming." Since the Navy Department had been fully informed concerning my intention to sail, I had desired and expected the Commandant to be so advised.

Some time before my arrival Captain Evans had received the orders from the Navy Department, previously mentioned, to investigate all matters contained in the compiled statement. But instead of obeying, he had gathered together a few selected Samoan chiefs on the 26th and 27th days of July. Captain Evans had then presented to this group a document compiled by himself and secured the signatures of thirty-nine chiefs to it, some by persuasion and some by threats. This paper [p. 325] stated that they were the chosen representatives of the Samoan Government and well satisfied with the methods used by the naval authorities in conducting affairs, and requested the President and the Secretary of the Navy to disregard the compiled statement. This was the only "investigation" carried on by Captain Evans in pursuance of his orders from the Navy Department, which apparently has been thoroughly satisfied with such a searching (?) inquiry into the situation. But the remaining chiefs of the Islands were so incensed at the action of Captain Evans and the thirty-nine chiefs that without any outside aid or assistance they compiled a letter on August 6 [p. 326], supporting the actions of Mr. Hannum and myself and the charges of the compiled statement. This was signed by 344 chiefs, each one signing it knowing that the commandant could throw him into prison for so doing, under his drastic enactment of January 4, 1921 [p. 324].

On my arrival at Pago Pago I was, of course, ignorant of all these events; but it is now apparent that Captain Evans knew that if I were allowed to go freely among the Samoans I would discover particulars of the coercion resorted to in order to secure signatures to his proclamation of July 27, and his further scandalous abuses of the defenseless Samoan people. Captain Evans, therefore, relying upon my ignorance of these developments, stated that the compiled statement was a mass of lies, to which I answered, "That remains to be proved." He continued: "Mr. Hannum, your attorney, has never been in Samoa; what does he know of conditions here? This whole thing is all lies and your only purpose in coming to the Islands is to exploit the natives." To this calumny I said nothing, for with no witness I knew it was useless. During all the interview the officer who conducted me was present and the Commandant's secretary was in the adjoining room with the door open, so seated that I could not see what he was doing. Mr. Hannum had written a letter of introduction for me to the Commandant, who now read that communication and asked, "What is the nature of the report you are bringing?" and desired that I deliver it to him.

This I refused to do, but offered to give it to all the chiefs, the Fono, in his presence, if he would call them together, and told him there was nothing in it which he was not at liberty to know. He made no reply but asked, "Whom did Mr. Hannum see in Washington?" When I answered he said, "I don't care how many Congressmen and Senators are on your side," and so saying arose and ordered the officer to return me to the steamship and to see that I left no communications ashore and had no intercourse with anyone. I then asked Captain Evans if I could not await the return of the steamship from Sydney, Australia, with relatives at Apia, but he refused. That evening after the steamship was well at sea I sent a radio message to my wife via Fiji, advising her of the situation. On its receipt Mr. Hannum wrote in protest to the Secretary of the Navy, requesting permission for me to land and remain in Samoa on the return of the steamship from Sydney. Mr. Denby replied by telegraph that he was "convinced that Department should not interfere with Governor's authority and action in this case." He did not assign any reasons.

In the meantime several chiefs were thrown into jail for openly expressing their indignation at my treatment and the treachery of the thirty-nine chiefs, and Captain Evans and his assistant, Sydney D. Hall, whom he had appointed to serve as judge, began a course of still further persecution and usurpation of Samoan rights, by taking away from the chiefs who openly refused to submit to such tyranny the titles inherited and bestowed under the Samoan Government. At present these officers are conferring these titles upon other Samoans in violation of the Constitution of the United States. After the long voyage to Sydney and return, the steamship reached San Francisco again on September 20, 1921, and I then found awaiting me the document signed on August 6 by the 344 chiefs. On September 6 they signed a still stronger letter.

As soon as possible after my return, Mr. Hannum wrote to the Secretary of the Navy and to the President, although in the meantime both these officials had sent letters on October 10 to the thirty-nine Samoan chiefs in answer to the proclamation of July 27. Mr. Denby finally acknowledged the receipt of Mr. Hannum's communications both to himself and the President on November 21, stating merely that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were receiving "appropriate consideration." On December 28 Mr. Hannum and I received the document "To Whom it May Concern" [p. 328] signed by a majority of the adult men of the Islands, including the 344 chiefs, which upholds us fully in our efforts.

Of Americans who believe the fundamental principles announced as the basis for this great nation, that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights of Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" and that no governments should be instituted among men except with the consent of the governed, I ask assistance in obtaining a full, fair, and impartial investigation of the Samoan situation—an investigation not conducted by the Navy Department, which is involved in the charges, but an inquiry by some impartial person or commission who will have authority to receive full testimony from the Navy Department and naval officers and likewise from the Samoan people aided by such counsel as they may require.

Timber Miners or Timber Farmers?

By EDWARD RICHARDS

THE American lumberman is a timber miner. He thinks of his forest as a solid mass of raw material which he is working up for sale. He does not think of, and treat accordingly, the forest as a living, growing, crop-producing resource. His way of thinking is a relic of the early days of this country when everyone spoke of the "inexhaustible" resources of the United States. The result of such thinking is the reckless exploitation of our forests which is almost universally practiced in logging operations. The mature timber is there waiting to be harvested. The most money can be made by going in once, taking everything that can be handled at a profit, and then getting out and going elsewhere, allowing the land to revert to the State for taxes. It will take a life-time for a new forest to grow. Why fuss with such a proposition at all? Clean up and get out. This has been and largely still is the psychology of the American lumberman. Its results as affecting the forests of the country may be summed up in two words—*forest devastation.*

The proper handling of forests on our State and Federal lands is now well established in the public mind and is rapidly becoming a fact in the woods. But forestry on private lands, especially big economic timber tracts in the far South and far West, has not begun. Forest fire-protection has been established in places, but forest fire-protection is not forestry. Fire-protection is necessary but by no means all. Boiled down, the work of the forester is just one thing, i.e., the continuous production of forest crops. On this basis forestry has not begun to be practiced on privately owned, large-sized, economic timber tracts in the United States, with the exception of a few paper companies in the Northeastern States, whose supply of raw material has been nearly exhausted and whose very existence necessitates a perpetuation of their forests.

Meanwhile our timber situation grows worse and worse. Three-fifths of all our virgin timber is already gone and we are cutting the remainder four times as fast as it is growing. The center of our production of lumber has migrated from New England to New York, thence to Pennsylvania, moved in turn to the Lake States and the South, until now after less than 100 years our country has to look to the Pacific Coast for the bulk of its wood supplies for the future. The shipments of Western timber to the East are increasing all the time. Today Western lumber is sent by ship down the Pacific Coast, through the Panama Canal, up through the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic to New York. There it is unloaded on the docks, reloaded to freight cars, and hauled all the way to Chicago and other Middle Western points. Such a long and costly haul for the delivery of lumber is absurd when it is remembered that good pine lumber can be grown in Michigan and in the other Lake States on land millions of acres of which are today idle waste. Out of an original area of forest of 822 million acres only 137 million are left in virgin stands. Over 300 million acres of this cut-over land is unsuitable for farming and yet is not producing good timber for a second cut owing to the reckless methods of cutting used, the lack of seed trees of good species allowed to remain, and the damage from over-grazing, fire, and neglect. Eighty-one million acres, in addition to the above 300 million, is so badly damaged that it is a desert of briars, rocks, stumps, and scattered bushes. This huge area of eighty-one million acres of desert is as large as the combined total forest areas of France, Holland, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, and Denmark, and is being increased by continued reckless logging at the rate of three million acres per year.

The people of the United States use about 300 board feet of lumber per capita per year. This is two or three times as much as that used by the people of Europe, and it is much more than we ourselves will have to get along with when the shortage of wood becomes acute. For let it be understood once for all, the United States is going to have a timber shortage in about twenty-five years. This is inevitable because for the past fifty years we have been destroying our forests and none have been planted to replace them. As it takes over fifty years to grow saw-timber, and as none was planted fifty years ago, when our remaining virgin forests are all gone, which will be in from twenty-five to fifty years, there will be nothing to cut in the way of new growth. A shortage of lumber, therefore, is inevitable.

"But," the incredulous reader replies, "we can get our lumber from Canada or from Europe or the tropics." Unfortunately this is not a solution. If we cut and imported every stick of timber growing in Canada, at our present rate of consumption we would use it all up in twenty years. Mexico already imports lumber for her own needs. So does most of Europe, Russia alone having enough to export some to other countries. The tropical forests are made up largely of species with very heavy, very hard wood, while the bulk of our uses for lumber call for soft woods, pine, fir, and the like.

One often hears that the substitutes for wood are replacing it so rapidly that ultimately little or no wood will be used. But this fails to consider the fact that new uses for wood are being discovered more rapidly than are substitutes for it. Altogether the cold facts of the case inevitably point in one direction, and one only. America is facing a severe shortage of wood, and it can get wood only by growing it itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first step in getting the United States seriously started on the road toward real forestry practice is to stop the further devastation of our remaining forests. For, by seeing that the logging now going on in the virgin forests which remain is so regulated that a young forest is established as fast as the mature trees are cut, our huge area of waste land will at least not be increased. Next to this comes the protection of forests from fire. Today this is only one-third accomplished, taking the country as a whole. Third comes the gigantic task of reforesting the cut-over and waste lands. For the lumberman seriously to practice forestry a new point of view is needed. He must become a timber farmer instead of remaining what he is now—a timber miner.

In its effect upon other important factors in our national life the timber-mining psychology is almost as bad as in its effect upon the forests. Take labor, for instance. A large lumber company owns a quarter of a million acres of pine land. Its timber-miner's psychology demands rapid clear cutting. This means that the logging camps have to be moved every two or three years as the timber is cut off around them. This constant migration prevents the establishment of any permanent form of settlement. All communication with the outside world is and remains most primitive. No houses are built that will adequately serve as permanent homes. No schools are established. No permanent stores are started. There is nothing but a few log huts in a wilderness. No women—good, bad, or indifferent—will come to such a place to live. The men, therefore, must either leave their homes or have no families if they want to work in the camps. This makes most of the woodsmen homeless, womanless, and childless. They have to live in freight cars or big bunk houses with crowds of other men like themselves. Vermin abounds. There is nothing to uplift and very much to degrade. There is nothing to do at night and no reading or amusements of any kind beyond what the men can scare up for themselves. Their constant dissatisfaction with such a life keeps them forever moving from camp to camp. Such movement prevents their becoming residents of any place, and this in turn deprives them of their vote. They have, therefore, no say whatever over the local government, and are considered and spoken of by townspeople as migratory workers, the scum of the earth, and an undesirable element, and are treated to rotten bootleg whiskey, herded in a red-light district, and fleeced of their wages as long as their money, earned by hard, dangerous work, holds out. When at last they go broke they are told to move on, arrested for vagrancy if they loiter, and treated roughly if they protest.

Add to this the autocracy of many camp bosses and the hopelessness of it all, and it is easy to see how any red-blooded human being would tend to feel resentful. Everything is organized against him. He is not even allowed to form a union, the union organizers being run out of the country in short order. To such a group of men deprived of everything most cherished by the people of America, and thus kept in their place—the bottom—by respectable society, injustice is the one outstanding feature of life, and resistance to injustice with any and all the means left at their disposal seems to be the clear, and all too natural, duty. A militant, fighting labor organization like the Industrial Workers of the World, which is the open, avowed enemy of big business interests and capital, appeals to men in this condition, and when they join and demand better treatment, they are beaten, tarred and feathered, or given long jail sentences. While by no means agreeing with all of the tactics or ideas of the I. W. W., as a technical forester who knows something from personal experience of conditions in our lumber camps and of the injustice heaped upon "the blanket stiff" by society as a whole, it is a fair thing to say that the I. W. W. is the most unjustly treated body of men in America today.

It is, however, unfair to blame everything on the lumberman. He is only the victim of the policy of private ownership of forest land and the timber-mining psychology. Unless taxes are adjusted in a manner suitable to the growing of timber, it is impossible to undertake it as a profitable business and unless fire risk is greatly reduced no man can feel safe in putting his money into forest plantations. But while striving to be just to all, it is necessary to remember that tax adjustment and fire protection alone will not solve our problem. Forest devastation must be stopped and only national legislation can do it.

In the Snell bill, S2740, the Federal Government offers to assist the States with aid and money if the States will pass forestry laws to stop forest devastation. There are a number of minor points also, such as fire protection, research, and the like, in which the Federal Government will help the States. Under the Snell bill, however, the States are to be the final authority. If they do not care to do anything, they do not have to. This bill is approved by the lumbermen, some foresters, and a good many other people.

The Capper bill, S1135, authorizes and empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to find out what needs to be done in each forest region of the United States and then to see that it is done. Enforcement is to be by taxation as in the case of the oleomargarine law. A tax of five cents per thousand board feet is imposed on all lumber cut in the way directed by the Federal Government and $5 per thousand board feet if these regulations are not observed. Control is unified and a single broad policy for the whole country and every section of it can be followed. Probably most foresters agree that this would be the ideal plan.

The Snell bill is a State's Rights bill, it transfers the responsibility of public regulation over private property from the Federal Congress to the State legislatures. The Capper bill settles this point once and for all through the Federal body, and, inasmuch as the timber problem is a national problem, the Capper bill is on the right track. Also under the Snell bill the treeless States, like Kansas and Nebraska, are at the mercy of the legislatures of the timbered States, and the hearings in Washington brought out the fact that the more heavily timbered States were the least interested in the conservation of our forests. Inasmuch as five States —Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon, and California— are the only ones which will be exporting lumber to other States in another ten years, it is of the utmost importance to the rest of the country that the legislatures of these States shall not be given the power to dictate what shall be done with what is left of the nation's forests. Under the Snell bill these State legislatures will decide, with the help of the timber lobbies. Under the Capper bill, the Federal Government will say what must be done.

Perhaps there is not to be any national forestry legislation passed this year. There has been great interest in both the Snell and Capper bills, but perhaps neither of them will become law in 1922. Such far-reaching movements take time. But two things are sure. The first is that some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sort of law to control, direct, and properly conserve our vanishing forests is absolutely necessary and is of vital importance to every individual in America, for we all use wood. The second is that any such law to be adequate must have teeth in it and must be national in its scope, control, and administration.

This Story Is Called: "What Shall We Do About the Heathen in Mongolia?"

By LOUIS WEITZENKORN

FOR the life of me I cannot disentangle two stories. They have fashioned themselves together in my mind like a pair of amorous angle worms for whom parting would mean mutilation. One is concerned with the life of a mule, a mule that lived and passed in the bowels of an anthracite coal mine. The other has to do with a man named Jenkins who lived and passed as a guard on a subway train which ran from George Washington Park to 437th Street and back again.

The mule was called Buck and was born nine years ago in the mule barns of a coal mine, a thousand feet below the surface of the earth. When he was old enough, when his muscles were almost powerful enough, an agent of the subway—I mean the coal company—put Buck to work hauling empty coal cars from the foot of a shaft to 437th Street—I told you this story was all mixed up in my brain. Buck hauled from the shaft to a coal seam several miles away and back again.

And now to get this tale as straight as possible. It was Thomas Jenkins who got the job in the subway seven years ago and opened car doors on a train from George Washington Park to 437th Street and back again. When Jenkins was given his job they told him to report at 437th Street every morning at five, five punctually, and there get on his train and work through until five in the afternoon, five not quite so punctually, after which he was a free man until five punctually next morning including Sundays. That, of course, is an indirect quotation from the man who gave Thomas Jenkins his job and the author should not be credited with the language. Thomas Jenkins asked how much he would be paid for these twelve daily hours of work and he was told that sixteen dollars and a few cents would about cover his value as a green hand but that there would be great chances of advancement.

He lived on 350th Street near a large gas tank. He had a wife and four children which, dividing six into sixteen dollars and some cents, gives an arithmetical answer in fractions. But they lived on this amount, for Thomas Jenkins had no carfare to pay, as he could walk each morning to the 350th Street subway station to get a train uptown and each night walk from the 350th Street subway station west toward the gas tank.

A man with four children and a wife, it is said, is anxious to hold hard to his job and anxious to get advancement. So every morning Thomas Jenkins arose at four o'clock, swallowed down some coffee made the night before, took a lunch put up the night before, and hurried to his work. He always arrived there a half hour ahead of time, helped the oilers or the wheel inspectors, or erased smutty pencil drawings from the advertising cards. Sometimes when there was nothing to do but await his train he would stuff a pipe and smoke in the seclusion of a lavatory.

In seven years' time Thomas Jenkins became familiar enough with his work. Indeed, he had the familiarity which breeds contempt. When he began, as a green hand, he called clearly, with careful articulation, the stations. Four Hundred and Thirty-seventh Street, Four Hundred and Sixteenth Street—came out as precisely as an English actor might call them. Old ladies riding uptown never fluttered about if they were riding near Thomas Jenkins's platform because, after a station or two, they knew there was a guard whose enunciation was flawless.

And thus for seven years, or to be exact, six and a half years, Thomas Jenkins worked. Morning, through darkness, walking down into the 350th Street station. Night, through darkness, walking up from the 350th Street station, and all day, including Sundays, down in the beautifully lit tunnels, he hauled coal cars—blast it!—he rode the platform, opening and closing doors under the city.

Strangely enough, however, his advancement never came. Perhaps he was too good in the particular work he had been set to do, or perhaps among the thousands working for the company he was overlooked. A dim event, far away from Thomas Jenkins, a street-car strike in a neighboring city, was, however, followed by a two-dollar raise. It was one of those coincidences which make up life.

As we said, when six and a half years had passed he grew a bit contemptuous. He began by not arriving a half hour ahead of time to wipe the penciled mustaches off those ladies on cold cream advertisements. Then he began slurring the station names and the ever-thickening multitude, sweaty in summer, wet in winter, grew distasteful to him. He dared on occasions to be surly with passengers who missed getting off at their rightful stations.

Then:

He told a pompous gentleman with a white waistcoat and a roast-beef face to—"Go to thunder, you old buzzard! I ain't a slave!" And the pompous gentleman was one of those lawyers who appear in night courts and day courts for the company to prosecute pickpockets and mashers and rowdies. He reported Guard Number Such and Such.

The next morning at five, punctually, Thomas Jenkins was paid off. He was stunned a bit. He forgot the 437th Street station wasn't the 350th Street station and dazedly made his way up the stairs and out. It was coldly winterous. A whipping wind blew up from the river and cut at his face. And then, suddenly, Thomas Jenkins threw his hands to his eyes and moaned.

A passerby stopped.

"What's the matter, old man?"

Thomas Jenkins drew a hand down, waved it toward the east.

"I'm going blind! Something's wrong with my eyes—it's all white when I look over there!"

The passerby laughed ironically. "You're going crazy, you mean. That's the dawn, sunrise, daylight. You'd better get your nut examined."

Oh, yes. That mule Buck. The owners of the coal mine took Buck up above ground and put him staggering into a pasture where retired horses and mules live out their declining years. After a day or so Buck got his sight back and, having neither wife nor children, he munched grass as contentedly as any other old reprobate without a conscience.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Job-Hunting in the Country

By A MECHANIC

IN these days of hard times much is written about the unemployment situation in the cities and the plight of the unfortunate men there without jobs. They are pictured sitting on the park benches or lounging in the public libraries, eating the bitter bread of sweet charity—when they can get it. Our small towns and country villages also have their unemployment problem—towns and villages where there are no park benches, municipal lodging-houses, or free public libraries where a man can go for shelter in the cold of winter, and no places where he can obtain even a little food. This probably explains, to some extent, the flocking of the workless masses to the cities in these freezing months.

To my mind, the most pitiful, the most discouraging, and the most mournful sight in the world is a man looking for work—with no work to be had. From my own experience with and observation of workers out of work, I firmly believe that the average jobless man is willing to work and to do any kind of work offered to him.

Here is my experience. By trade I am an automobile mechanic with several years' experience at all makes of cars. I had steady employment during the past two years; and up to a few months ago I had no difficulty in finding occupation at my trade. My pay averaged from $35 to $40 a week. Since my last "lay-off" in August I have applied for work in over forty-five different garages and repair-shops in Westchester County. In my quest for work I have spent many dollars for carfare, which I could ill afford, and I have walked many miles without being able to find a steady job at my trade. When I did succeed in getting some work for a time it was at far lower wages and far longer hours than usual. When work got slack I was obliged to work only half-time, which decreased my pay to $12 for a whole week and thus left me with a wage barely sufficient to keep body and soul together. And I have a wife to provide for as well as myself. Inasmuch as the country also has a housing shortage and rent problem, it may be of interest to note that I am paying $25 a month for a six-room cottage *without* improvements. Furthermore, coal is $16 a ton in the town where I live.

Unlike their brothers of the metropolis the automobile mechanics in the country have no organization to protect their interests. The average garage and repair-shop owner hires his men at his own price; and the mechanic has no choice. Wages at the present time are about forty-five cents an hour for the average mechanic's labor. The boss charges on the average $1.25 an hour for work done on cars. The car owners, knowing or suspecting this piece of profiteering on the part of garage owners, consequently have only the most necessary repair work done, work which they themselves or their drivers are unable to do at home. Hence, to a considerable extent, the slump in work and wages in the automobile repair shops.

Since there are no set qualifications in the automobile mechanic's trade outside of the cities, anybody handy with a screw-driver and a monkey-wrench can apply for a job in a country garage; and in ordinary times he may obtain a place as a "mechanic." Bosses will hire such inexperienced men and boys; and this no doubt accounts for many of the unexplained accidents to cars just out of the repair shops. It certainly explains something of the difficulty in getting employment, despite experience, at the present time.

The arrogance, the indifference, and the unfriendly attitude which some of the employers exhibit toward a man asking for work are often sufficient to extinguish the little hope and courage he may have in his heart. For instance, at a certain garage in White Plains where I applied for work the manager looked me over carefully before he answered my request. He noticed that I wore a pair of overalls and that my shoes had not been polished for some time. Sneeringly he dismissed me with the remark: "We are not hiring any bums and floaters."

Thinking that there might be an opening, I applied again some days later in the week, dressed in my Sunday clothing. On entering the stockroom, I encountered the same man and addressed him in the hope of making a better impression and perhaps obtaining a job. He was very pleasant at first but when I told him that I was looking for work as a mechanic he grew sarcastic at once and gave me to understand that there was no work in the shop. "What do you mean," he asked, "looking for a grease mutt job dressed up like a banker?"

After two weeks of job-hunting, I entered a small garage in a nearby village with a sense of desperate need to find work. The owner, who treated me fairly well, informed me that while he had no employment for a first-class mechanic, he was willing to hire me at $4 a day. He was building an addition to his garage, and I started in to dig the foundation. Before I knew it, I was doing carpenter work at $4 a day, while between times I repaired cars! I can imagine what a brotherhood of carpenters would have had to say about that if there had been an active local union which had discovered the fact. In about two months, the addition was finished and I was again out of a job. It was the same old story once more—up in the morning and out looking for work.

The principal industry in the town where I live is woodworking. The largest mill, which during the past few years has given employment to over 300 men, is now closed. The mill stands useless and deteriorating, and the men are idle. Many of them have found employment elsewhere; and through their moving away the town has been deprived of industrious citizens and a much-needed prosperity it had enjoyed in the past. This condition is typical of many small manufacturing towns in the region; it is either "half-time" or "slowing-up" or "no work at all."

Plenty of other men have had experiences similar to mine in dealing with small employers. I have an acquaintance, an ex-soldier, who was gassed in the trenches of France. He lost his job last summer, shortly after he had been married. He was facing hard conditions in many ways, and he took the first place offered to him. He became a farm-foreman on a gentleman's estate not far from the town where I live. The work was heavy and the wages were small; but he was delighted at having a chance to get a living. He received payment in full for the first month of his services. After that his employer informed him that, owing to financial difficulties in his business, the workers on his place would have to wait for their pay. Now, after some months of hard work, this man has not seen any of the money that is due him. He has exhausted his credit in the village stores and is obliged to live on the charity of others. If he quits his job, he will not get any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his pay without going to law—which he cannot possibly afford, even if he felt that he had a prospect of obtaining a favorable judgment. If he stays, his employer may perhaps pay him, at least in part, some day, when he gets ready.

Naturally, the feeling of this ex-service man is most bitter; but he has no redress. Hundreds are in about the same case and mood. Only the other day I had a talk with a man who, like myself, was out of work. He was a man with more than ordinary intelligence. During the past summer he had been employed on one of the large estates which abound in this section. His employer, the man told me, had gone on a trip to South America and like many others had closed up his fine country home for the winter. My friend, who was neither a Red Republican nor a Bolshevik, by the way, was very resentful of our present system of distribution and exploitation.

"What can an honest man do?" exclaimed he. "Under such conditions it's slavery. Something will have to be done to change things or else the country is going to see trouble. It's either *work* or *starve*." When there is no work to be had, the answer is easy. Starvation is a bad adviser, as any man who knows the unemployed must realize.

"What do you think would be the best remedy for the present situation?" I asked.

"Let the Government get busy and collect some of the billions it has standing out as loans to other countries. Let France and England and the other foreign nations that owe us money come across; and then let the United States Government use the money in big works of construction, such as roads and canals and hospitals.

"The working men in this country are getting tired of this conference business," he declared. "Committee appointments and special investigations of the unemployment question! They investigate everybody and everything under the sun; and in the end they find next to nothing! Look at our employer friends—how greedily they are hanging on to the dollars and how calmly they are slashing wages right and left. Readjustment, they call it, which in other words means nothing more or less than reduction of wages."

This same feeling of bitterness, of pent-up hatred and of disgust with our system of work and division of wealth, and the dependence upon wages which means slavery to the man without savings, I have found in the hearts of many other working men with whom I have come in contact.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter has always stoutly maintained that entertainment and adventure—and by that he does not mean holdups—could be found even in the Bronx and Brooklyn. He is frankly jealous of his friend who has proved it. The gentleman in question having embarked for an address in parts of the Bronx to him unknown sought the aid of a traffic cop on a busy corner. The officer gave him the information that he desired and then said: "Now do you mind my asking you a question?" "Go ahead," was the answer, "I'll tell you before you ask. You're not the first inquirer. I am 6 feet 5½ inches tall." "No, no," said the cop, "not that. What month were you born in?" "June," said the Drifter's friend. "There," said the cop, turning to a man with whom he had been in conversation, "hand over that cigar." The man who had been silent entered the discussion. "Yes," said he, "this officer here claims he can tell nine times out of ten what month a person's born in by looking at him. What's more I've not been able to catch him yet." And the officer explained: "Yes, I can do it. It's by assimilation. You see I stand here on this corner, and I look around and I hear people ask questions. After that's gone on for as many years as it has with me, you get so you can tell what month a man's born in by the way he acts. . . . That's right, Mary [this to a woman driver who had missed his signal], you ought to look ashamed—she was born in October. Hey, Henry, is your arm paralyzed? Stick it out when you're going to turn. Now," turning to the Drifter's friend, "by your looks you are a college fellow. You ought to be able to explain this. It's a great secret. If you're born in June, you're likely to be the very unlucky or very lucky——" What else the children of June might be the Drifter did not learn; but he looks forward to searching out that Bronx corner and investigating further the science of birth months.

* * * * *

AGAIN the Drifter has put his foot in it. He enlivened the Washington's Birthday issue of *The Nation* with a story of a judge who had broken up a family, sending the woman and her five children to an institution, on the ground that the father and mother were morons and the youngsters were not properly cared for. The Drifter quoted a letter purporting to have been written by the father which was so good that it made the Drifter doubt if he himself could pass a sufficiently creditable examination to be rated as a moron. Now comes a letter to the Drifter from a woman physician in Philadelphia in which the writer says:

> Mr. Drifter, how many times did you read Mr. Sundsmo's letter before you published it? Won't you read it again now and look for the things that must have escaped you then? I hope you will see, as I do, that Mr. Sundsmo did not write that letter. Someone wrote that letter who had in view not the reunion of a family dealt with unjustly but the creation of doubt as to the fitness of a body of earnest men and women, the trained social workers of the community, to carry the burden of responsibility that has been laid upon them.
>
> I am not a social worker and I can therefore understand from a lay point of view how the Sundsmo incident and the Sundsmo letter will affect a great number of your readers. My first impression was that someone had gone too far, that a dangerous power had been given into unfit hands. But my second impression is that this incident has been presented in this way as part of a propaganda of which I am becoming more and more aware to discredit education and the scientific approach to social problems that are at once feared and hated by certain forces in this country.
>
> Where do you stand in the matter? Were you misled by your first rush of indignation and do you now see the danger of letting statements of the kind go to press unchallenged? It may be the fact that the Sundsmo family has been broken up by a social agency, but what are the other facts, and what is the truth?

When the Drifter gets a letter like that, up go his hands. He doesn't know the "other facts" nor has he the weest suspicion of the truth. He told the story in the innocence of his heart without for a moment supposing that it might be a flivver. He's not sure that it is yet, but he is more than certain, may it please the Court, that he is a dub without extenuating circumstances and a moron in the second degree. Were it otherwise he himself would have been a judge, a social worker, or a lady doctor instead of merely

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Letters to the Editor should ordinarily not exceed 500 words, and shorter communications are more likely to be printed. In any case the Editor reserves the right to abridge communications.

We Revoke This Poet's License

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Although finding fault with my favorite journal is as painful to me as whipping my favorite dog, I must take pen in hand and chastise *The Nation* for a terrific blunder appearing in its pages last week. I refer to the poem Culture, by Clement Wood.

The first three verses of Mr. Wood's bit are beautiful. We all have known such oaks. But in the last verse, where "they" make the oak into pulpwood, there is something wrong. Oak is one of the very few woods that cannot possibly be converted into pulpwood. "That its bleached flesh and bones may bear these words, upon this page," is beautiful sentiment but awfully poor practice. The pages of *The Nation* are made of poplar and spruce. Oak, I repeat, is not a pulpwood. Even if it were, the cost of handling such a heavy wood would make the poem impossible.

Could not Wood (the poet) recast his final stanza making the oak into furniture instead of paper?

NERO SMITH,
Secretary, the Society for Disseminating Grammar-School Knowledge Among Poets and Novelists

Brookline, Massachusetts, February 27

Our Own Fascisti

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The other day the American Legion held a conference in Indianapolis and plans were formulated and suggestions made for legislation. Needless to say, the "Americanization" problem was on the program; indeed it occupied a very prominent place. Not only are the "poor ignorant foreigners" who are a "prey for the radicals" to be "Americanized," but the Yankee is also to get a good dose of the same treatment. Mr. Alvin M. Owsley, director of the Americanization Commission, suggested physical training for young Americans, because, according to war statistics, one out of every four persons was unfit for military service on account of physical disabilities. As in France, Owsley would have the United States inaugurate compulsory physical training to develop healthy cannon fodder.

The chauvinist has invariably bragged about the American school system and the lack of illiteracy among native Americans, but now he is compelled to admit that there is something wrong with the system of education and that the average American is not the scholar he was believed to be in the past. Says the same Owsley: "Many natives in the army during the war could not read a written order; hence we must reorganize our school system in order that the soldier of the future wars may be able to read an order given by a superior officer." (But those implacable and barbarous Bolsheviki are educating people whom they never expect to induct into the "Red Army.") Moreover, in order to make it certain that our next generation turns out to be composed of Einsteins and Edisons, *the Legion agency is to assist in the enforcement* of the compulsory education laws. The qualifications have also been prescribed, namely, a "strong" course in citizenship training and a thorough course in United States history and the Declaration of Independence. Suppose that in the "strong" and thorough course of citizenship both the teacher and the pupil lay "strong" emphasis on the words to be found in the Declaration of Independence, viz.: "But when a long train of abuses and usurpation, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guaranties for their security." If we are to judge the intentions, sentiments, and views of the Legion in the light of its deeds and utterances, we find it to be diametrically opposed to the words above quoted from the document it urges to be used in the schools.

Indianapolis, Indiana, January 25 J. H. H.

Waste Through Labor Turnover

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The article in your issue of February 15 on Waste in Business is deserving of a larger circulation than is furnished by any one journal, but the public is so little interested in the problems there set forth that such articles are not sought for general circulation. It lies within the power of *The Nation* to lead the liberal journals in providing a cure for this apathy of the public. This cure cannot be obtained by the Kansas Industrial Court nor by the proposed visitorial powers of the New York State Industrial Commission provided in Senator Duell's bill. It can be obtained by requiring annual or semi-annual publication of labor turnovers by employers of labor.

Such publication would add little to the burdens many employers now carry. In addition to the average number of employees now reported to the New York State Industrial Commission, the employer need additionally report only the total number hired for any purpose whatever (whether actually put on the pay roll or not), the total number discharged or leaving, and the maximum number in his employ at any one time. Such a report should be filed with the Industrial Commission, verified by affidavit, and published, say twice, in a newspaper of general circulation in the county where the employer's business is located. It should also be required to be included in each report to the stockholders made by the officials of any corporation. It might be well to require such reports only from employers of, say, thirty or more persons, and to provide that every report might also include any explanation, verified by the affidavit, that the employer desired to include.

The public would be astounded at the conditions revealed by such publication. When the subject is called to their attention most people expect a labor turnover like that of B. Seebohm Rowntree's cocoa factory in York, England, which is about 13 per cent. When labor turnovers like that of the Ford Motor Company for its fiscal year ending October, 1913 (54,000 hands hired and leaving, to maintain an average of 13,000), were published, people would demand that something be done. Yet such labor turnovers are typical of the department stores of New York and probably of other cities, and are probably common in other business enterprises. Moreover the average employer, even of the better sort, has the crudest ideas of what his labor turnover is. Through this law he would be warned of incipient labor troubles which are otherwise unsuspected until they break into a strike. Rowntree says that for any strike the employer is at least partly to blame; and that there is no more reason for an employer to have labor troubles than for a school-teacher to have analogous troubles.

New York, February 13 EDWARD THOMAS

Our Passionate Politics

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I paused briefly in the Senate this afternoon to hear Watson deliver an impassioned address on how we were going the way of empire. His senatorial audience was as follows: Republicans—Poindexter; Democrats—Overman, Heflin, Harris, Robinson, Williams.

It's wonderful how we've persisted as a nation for 146 years.

Washington, March 1 G. H. E.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dress, Sex, and Birth Control

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I want to remonstrate against certain arguments employed by the writer of a letter on Women and Their Clothes (February 8) because they are based on a universally accepted false belief about women in relation to sex—a false belief which is responsible for much of the social injustice in sex matters from which women suffer. In attempting to show that the trend of modern dress indicates "emancipation from the preoccupation of mate-hunting" he says "the number of those who have no time to mate has increased" and mentions the statistical number of spinsters as proof. I claim that there is no man *or woman* who has not "time" (i. e., inclination) to mate. "Spinsters" are not abnormal creatures devoid of the sex impulse. Spinsters are inevitable as the result of a numerical preponderance of women over men, combined with a monogamistic marriage system. The fact of their spinsterhood proves nothing about their instincts, impulses, or desires.

The writer calls attention to the fact that medical science has reduced the death-rate so that a relative reduction of the birth-rate is necessary. He optimistically looks for a partial readjustment of this situation by the decrease of the mating impulse—which he *thinks* he sees. The mating impulse is so fundamental that it is second only to the instinct for self-preservation. Anyone who claims that it is decreasing, or ever will, is running amuck in a tangle of self-deception about the most fundamental force in life. What he really sees is nothing short of a tragedy and a social outrage—the spectacle of millions of women forced by a tangled economic and social system into unnatural, incomplete lives of celibacy. If "spinsterhood" (a condition in which society denies women their natural right to normal sex expression) could function as a safety-valve to the imminent dangers of overpopulation, it would still be unjustified.

It is for society to accept the one practical method of birth control, education for universal knowledge of scientific contraceptives. It is also up to society to concern itself with adjusting its antiquated moral code to the facts of existing conditions and make it possible for *all* women, as well as *all* men to experience the normal sex expression that is necessary to a normal life.

Clothing will always have some subtle sex suggestiveness—a fact that is no cause for concern. But the present display in dress of an overdeveloped sex consciousness is the result of an abnormal sex system. Life changes radically but society admits no adjustment of the sex relation to new conditions. When honest sane thinking about our modern sex problem becomes general, and action follows sincere convictions as to the fundamental decencies, then we may look for a disappearance of the many manifestations of super-normal sexuality.

New York, February 17 Mildred L. Prince

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: May I add my word to your open forum on birth control? I have read two books on the subject by one of the leaders in the movement (a man!) and, as a woman, I resent the sexual enslavement of womankind that they imply. Men and women are both counseled to indulge freely in the pleasures of the flesh as the senses dictate, and told that all that is necessary to salvation is a thorough knowledge of contraceptives. Marriage is optional, and birth control is particularly desirable in cases of non-marriage that the world's scorn may not fall upon the woman. A wife is warned against losing the love (lust would be a better term, I think) of her husband by failure to appeal always to his senses in her dress and every-day demeanor. She is advised to "flirt a little" with other men if his desire for possession needs whetting. All this is called "the democracy of sex."

Since this is the kind of erudition that is being circulated as standard birth-control literature (this man's books have been advertised in many of the leading magazines), the question resolves itself into one of morality. If the birth controlists would advocate continence as the ideal, while seeking the privilege of teaching birth control where economic and physical conditions seemed to demand it, the movement would be on an entirely different basis. It is their own ignorance and the sensuality of some of their best-known writers that keeps it still in the mire of obscenity.

Birth control is at best a makeshift. It can never be an ideal —that is birth control by contraception—so why not, as Tolstoi says, take a straight line for the model even though the hand is weak and draws a crooked line?

Fanny Bixby Spencer

Costa Mesa, California, February 2

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Many points have been made in the discussion concerning birth control, and emphasis has been laid on two factors that might obviate the necessity of this measure—the economic independence of women and continence in the marital relation.

I have no argument to present, but there is one fact from the woman's point of view that needs mention, which your readers, through ignorance or delicacy, have missed. In my work I have come into intimate contact with a great number of young women in the early twenties, married and unmarried, and all economically independent. In a great number of cases the lack of sex life, the conscious or unconscious repression of normal instincts and tendencies necessitated by the enforced postponement of marriage or the practice of continence in marriage already contracted, because economic conditions made children out of the question, has bred a morbidity, a depression, and an outlook on life that is far from healthy or helpful to the social organization.

Our young women, psychically and physically, bear the brunt of society's opposition to birth control.

New York, January 28 L. S. Rogers

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In connection with the extensive correspondence published in *The Nation* on birth control I think it is evident to all that some plan for the control of population is immediately necessary.

There are three particular ways of controlling the number of children. First, by outright murder after birth; second, by destroying the unborn child by any of the various methods; and third, by the practice of voluntary continence. The first of these is a relic of barbarism, likewise the second. There are many more objections to the second. The third is the most humane, the purest method known, from the standpoint of both mother and child. Moreover, a man's uncontrolled sexual thirst which dominates woman is one of the worst relics of barbarism. Are the supposedly civilized men of this supposedly civilized world unwilling to recognize the purest and most civilized remedy for such undesirable economic conditions as exist today?

Frances L. Bliven

Cambridge, Massachusetts, January 27

From a Christian Scientist

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I like your up-to-date paper very much but I am always disappointed when you fail, in your usual free-for-all policy, to publish corrections and answers in regard to some of your incorrect statements about Christian Science. You have really never published anything in *The Nation* that was fair to Christian Science. Your attitude reminds me of the attitude of those who still believed the world was flat after it was discovered beyond a doubt that the earth is round.

New York, February 6 Marion May

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Artisan

By VIRGINIA WOODS MACKALL

You must choose
  The straight clean arrows of simplicity;
You must use
  A bow resilient as the curving sky.
Be sure your string
Is taut and strong enough to sing.

Then blind your fickle eyes.
  For passing game
    —Love, Wisdom, Youth—
May tempt you by surprise.
  Take wanton aim!
Perchance your arrow flies
  Straight to the hidden heart of Truth.

The Roving Critic

THE sense of sin rarely sleeps long in an American novelist; sooner or later it wakes and comes to the surface. Even F. Scott Fitzgerald, grown reflective, takes one of his gilded couples in "The Beautiful and Damned" (Scribner) past the age of radiance into a tawdry state for which the sin of futility is to blame. His Anthony Patch and his Gloria Gilbert cannot have their fling forever, waiting for a grandfather's millions. The bright beauty of Gloria fades a little, the brilliance of Anthony cracks: drink and the devil of idleness do for them. With an edifying irony Mr. Fitzgerald traces the dingy process, but he makes it very clear that edification is not—or is not yet—his forte. Compared, for instance, with the pitiful descent of Hurstwood in Theodore Dreiser's "Sister Carrie" the descent of Anthony Patch has the look of being argued out, of being made on a machine. Though at the end he has got to the foot of his ladder, he must have got there by falling unobserved past certain sections where the rungs were out. Nor does it increase the reality of the fall to allow him a penultimate hour of madness and an ultimate hour of victory, his millions in his hand. All that happens to him carries less of dramatic conviction than the single episode in the career of his wife when she finds, after long believing she could at any moment rehabilitate their fortunes on the screen, that instead she can play nothing better than the part of "a very haughty rich widow."

Of such flashes of drama there are only a few in the book. Its excellence lies in its rendering not of the ordinary moral universe but of that detached, largely invented region where glittering youth plays at wit and love. To youth like this the rest of the world seems to exist, as it seems to children, to thwart gay purposes. Why will old men not die and leave their money to those who know how to spend it exquisitely? Why does experience with its heavy feet come glowering over the green fields where Corydon romps with Amaryllis or into the cool shade where every gallant has his dainty marquise in a perpetual *fête champêtre?* Must the beautiful be damned? Because such questions are insistent Anthony and Gloria and their friends play madly, as if there were much to be done before wisdom catches them and spoils their rapture. They have, of course, their own young wisdom: they are full of careless speculation which gives edge and point to the story; they have a smart cynicism which often blinds it. But it is in their unclouded days that they delight, when wit heightens love and love warms wit. Then they flutter across the continent in a perpetual honeymoon. Then poverty touches them only as a jest, and languor not at all. They have beauty and health and fresh, contagious passion and merry eloquence. They are of the fellowship of Alcibiades and Lalage, of Mercutio and Rosalind.

If it was haste and insolence which hurt "This Side of Paradise," what hurts "The Beautiful and Damned" is deliberate seriousness—or rather, a seriousness not deliberated quite enough. Bound to bring some sort of instruction in, Mr. Fitzgerald pushes his characters downhill as if gravitation needed help. He must have lost some of his interest in them as they went down; at least he imparts interest less and less as they advance; his imagination flames only while they are at the summit. Few current writers can represent young love in its incandescence as he can, but his knowledge—so far as this novel goes to show—does not extend with the same accuracy to the seedy side of life which he has felt he must explore. He has trusted, one suspects, his doctrine rather more than his gusto. For this reason, too, he has, without adding much to the body of his style, sacrificed—or lost—some of the poetry which illuminated the earlier narrative and which illuminates the higher places of this one with a light never present unless there is genius not far off. Why did he have to mix good poetry with indifferent moralism? Moralists are plenty but poets few. It is encouraging, however, to see signs of increasing power in his work.

THE mode in fiction, turning away from the villages which it has lately been devastating with analysis, is for the moment tentative and experimental. In "Vandemark's Folly" (Bobbs-Merrill) Herbert Quick has gone back to the fashion of twenty years ago, when taste ran to historical romance with large scenes, large actions, large characters. Very much in the manner of David Ritchie in Winston Churchill's "Crossing" Jacobus Teunis Vandemark tells how he went west in the heroic days and grew up with the country. Dutch not Scotch, from New York not from Carolina, Jacob goes to Iowa not to Kentucky and gives himself to farming not to fighting. Yet the analogy between the two is very close. And it is close because they both descend, by the lineage of literature, from John Ridd in "Lorna Doone," that stupid, virtuous giant who must exhibit himself as doing great deeds or making noble sacrifices or winning ardent love without ever guessing it until some fellow-character in the novel points it out to him. The convention is always hard to accept, and it is harder than ever now that it has fallen a little out of sight. Jacob Vandemark, however, presuming on the old convention, stretches the possibilities till they crack: he is a marvel of precocity in all that concerns his hard head, and a simpleton in the affairs of his soft heart. The fellow does not come from life directly but only from life through at least one literary metempsychosis.

It is a pity, for "Vandemark's Folly" had a real chance to do more than it has done. The movement of the American population westward is a theme in which no novelist can fail to find stirring elements, and Mr. Quick, whose ancestors shared in the migration and who has long been thinking of this book, has found very many stirring elements in his material. There is a sense in it of the great drift of population, of the world turning over, of the center of things settling elsewhere. The pageant which the book presents, from the Erie Canal westward to Iowa, is rich and varied, though confined to the experience of one boy. There is a solid body of research back of the story, it is very clear, supporting the details of the journey and the settlement. Certain of the minor characters, who do not have to be romantic, are racy and notable. The style is free and charming and the general atmosphere open and frank. But to see wherein it falls short of some of the greatness with which it is credited, one has only to think of any of the better Icelandic sagas. The parallel is exact. The sagas, set down with scrupulous exactness or with the look of scrupulous exactness, are the records of certain settlers who went from an older country to a newer. They, unlike "Vandemark's Folly" with its romantic conventions, keep their eyes forever on the immediate facts of life as their writers understood them. They know how to represent heroic deeds by letting the deeds speak for themselves without the help of any chorus or sentimental overtones.

CARL VAN DOREN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Marriage

The History of Human Marriage. By Edward Westermarck. Fifth Edition, rewritten. The Macmillan Company, 3 vols. $25.

THE subject of marriage, regarded in its essential meanings, is of universal and everlasting interest. That proposition may look like a truism. But marriage in its narrow sense, as a mere social institution, is possibly of only local or temporary existence. In its true biological sense, however, marriage is no merely human institution; it is the substance of the process by which all the chief forms of life have persisted on the earth. Millions of years before Man appeared, supposing that self-consciousness ever arose, it is marriage that would have been a leading topic of meditation or of dispute. Still today the questions that most affect our well-being, or even continuance on the earth as individuals, as families, as nations, or as a species—the questions of heredity, eugenics, sex education, birth control, sterilization, divorce, the place of woman, and the care of the child—they are all merely aspects of the central problem of marriage. Into the making of a proper account of marriage there enter biology, physiology and embryology, psychology, ethnography, folk-lore, the study of magic and religion, economics, law. A really adequate book on marriage must not only be a book of profound importance for the welfare of the race; it must also be one of the most absorbingly interesting for all who feel the smallest concern in themselves or their fellows.

A completely adequate history of marriage we can hardly expect to see. No one man could master all the disciplines of study that must go to the making of it, and the separate work of a group of experts, each in his own field competent, could not be fused into any living and harmonious whole. But the nearest approximation to such a completely adequate history of marriage that has ever appeared, or that we are ever likely to see, is this great work of Professor Westermarck's in what is now, probably, its practically final shape.

Westermarck's "History of Human Marriage" has been a standard book on its subject ever since it first appeared thirty years ago. It was, at that time, the youthful production of an unknown student from Finland who had but lately acquired the foreign language in which he wrote. In an Introductory Note, Alfred R. Wallace pointed out some of its fresh and valuable qualities. Its conclusions were at some points opposed to those of various eminent authorities, but the new investigator commanded so immense a range of facts, he dealt with them in so critical, orderly, and scientific a spirit, he had so admirable a power of clear presentation, and was throughout so cautious and judicial, that his opinions could not fail to carry weight. It became clear, no doubt, as the years passed, that there were some aspects of the subject the author had passed over too lightly; there were others that, when the book appeared, no one had sufficiently recognized. What some might regard as a capital defect was the absence of first-hand and intimate knowledge of the more primitive life and customs of any extra-European people.

Mr. Westermarck proceeded to remedy this defect by spending six years in Morocco, learning to acquire, by contact with the natives, in their own language, not only a direct knowledge of customs and institutions, but an insight into the habits of thought of comparatively primitive peoples untouched by European civilization, yet remotely related to European stocks. How fruitful this experience proved is shown by Mr. Westermarck's book "Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco" and various other publications. It was in Morocco that he learned the large part that magic plays in the ritual of marriage, confirming what, since the first edition of this book was published, Sir James G. Frazer had shown of the place of magical beliefs and practices in all the great affairs of life, including marriage. So that whereas in the first edition Mr. Westermarck found a dozen pages enough for marriage rites, he finds three long chapters—and most delightful chapters they are—none too much now. Yet, he tells us, notwithstanding the enormous influence of magical beliefs on marriage rites, of which he has become aware since living in Morocco, the value of such rites for the study of the primitive and fundamental forms of marriage seems to him even less than he thought it before.

Although he has found it necessary to remold and rewrite this work so thoroughly, Mr. Westermarck remains true to the methods that guided him at first, and the two main points in his method are its biological basis and its inductive collection of comparative facts. From his present standpoint he is more inclined to extend and to fortify this method than to abandon it. The biological conception of marriage leads on to psychology, though not in itself necessarily psychological, and the psychological element in the processes of marriage is here far more elaborated than before. That the comparative way of progression may sometimes have defects when the facts collected are misunderstood or wrongly reported at the outside, Mr. Westermarck himself asserts, yet it remains the safest way; and when (as Mr. Westermarck rightly observes) we remember that Man, after all, is only a single species (Darwin sometimes applied comparison to two or more species), it is a completely legitimate way.

Other ways have sprung up in recent years, and in a new introductory chapter, On the Method of Investigation, Mr. Westermarck discusses them and compares them with his own. There is the way of Dr. Rivers in England and of the French school founded by Durkheim. These and other investigators are disposed to regard society as an organism which must be studied by methods of "pure" sociology. Explanations on the comparative basis, or on the psychological basis, are regarded as too hazardous and quite unnecessary. But, as Mr. Westermarck points out, while such hazards undoubtedly exist, the hazards of the other method are equal or even greater; Durkheim was prepared to draw conclusions concerning the religious conceptions of Man at large from the study of totemic Australian tribes, while Rivers, so opposed to psychological conjectures, is himself profuse in conjectures. But Mr. Westermarck, with the sanity and breadth which always inspire so much confidence in his work, is far from wishing to condemn methods to which he does not himself attach prime importance. He concludes that they are all helpful, each complementary to the others, and all likely to aid in enlarging and defining our knowledge.

If we compare this "History" in its full development with the other great work on which its author's fame is chiefly based, "The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas," the latter work appears as in effect a series of monographs on the various human virtues or vices—for what from one point of view is a virtue is sometimes from another a vice—but it is its unity which makes the "History" so impressive. A number of different avenues are opened before us, but each of them leads to the same great central human institution, each enables us to see better, from a fresh and illuminating point of view, some essential aspect of it.

Yet while the "History" is dominated by the sense of unity it is possible to find here, too, a series of fascinating monographs on the most diverse, the most attractive, sometimes the most practical topics. Courtship, modesty, self-decoration by ornament and clothing, the primitive pairing-season, and all the various forms of marriage, group-marriage, monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, celibacy, divorce (the author believes the tendency is toward divorce by mutual consent)—all these and many other topics render this "History" attractive to a multitude of various readers. It is inevitable that, when the sections of the work are thus examined in detail, criticisms arise.

The "History" was planned from the outset as even its name indicates on the broadest basis of natural science, but not only can we not expect to find an author, however painstaking and accomplished, proficient in every scientific discipline involved;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there cannot fail, also, to be aspects of the subject which, perhaps even deliberately, he leaves aside. Thus, though we find here chapters on celibacy and on divorce, there is no detailed consideration of the subject (even more germane to the central question) of the regulation of the size of the family, nor is there any mention of eugenics, although we are constantly brought close to unconscious eugenics. Abortion and infanticide have been dealt with elsewhere by Mr. Westermarck, and are only incidentally touched on here. But a chapter setting forth and elucidating the gradually progressive regulation and limitation of the size of the family—first by infanticide, then by abortion, and finally by deliberate contraception—would have been not only much to the point, but of real help in an age when this aspect of marriage has become so prominent, and when so many people who cling to the ideals of an earlier stage of civilization experience terror and indignation in the presence of later forms of civilization.

On some aspects of the history of marriage Mr. Westermarck was from the first opposed to influential schools of thought. This was especially so as regards the theory of the origin of later marriage systems out of a primitive promiscuity. Many eminent authorities have adopted this theory, which owed much to the brilliant and learned work of the Swiss jurist Bachofen, "Das Mutterrecht," published in 1861. From Switzerland, Rousseau, in the eighteenth century, brought a Romantic Movement into the world; from the same land, in the same century, Noverre came to renovate the ballet with the life-blood of romance; in our own century Swiss physicians have made a romantic religion out of psychoanalysis, much to the disgust of its founder. Similarly, it was from Switzerland, in the last century, that Bachofen came to bring the Romantic Movement into the origin of society, with his conception of a free, primitive community in which women ruled, for they alone were recognizable as parents. Mr. Westermarck here tells us that he had at first approached this question with a disposition to accept the sexual promiscuity of early Man. But the evidence failed to convince him even when writing the first edition of his "History."

Now he has gone into the matter far more elaborately, devoting seven chapters to a careful examination of the facts and of the arguments based on them, and still maintains his former position. With so powerful a presentation of the case against the theory of primitive promiscuity, it should no longer be possible for anyone to speak of that theory as "established." It may be, however, that many will still be inclined to believe, though they cannot prove, that, improbable as actual promiscuity may have been, early Man often passed through a stage, unlike that which prevails alike among the apes and any highly civilized peoples, marked by complex marriage relationship, or some form of group-marriage. We must not assume that early Man was monogamous because the apes frequently are. It is even possible that, if he had been, he would have remained much nearer to the apes. A complex marriage system, binding together a group of people, would not only constitute a valuable instrument for making associated progress in a still difficult world, but, without having any teleological end, it would form a highly important training in the discipline of the instincts and the development of the intelligence. Later, when other methods for seeking those ends became possible, the stress of circumstance on the sexual instinct might well fall away and the later condition of Man in this respect again approach that which existed in the root-stock from which Man sprang. That is possible to believe, though it is not at present possible to prove.

There is another important question, here dealt with through two chapters, on which Mr. Westermarck has not completely succeeded in carrying conviction, and has now modified his statement in form, though not in substance. That is the question of exogamy, or the prohibition to marry within the group, which Mr. Westermarck very reasonably associated with, and explained by, the generally greater sexual attraction felt for persons outside one's own domestic circle, and the consequent rarity of incestuous attraction. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Westermarck had placed the emphasis on the wrong side of this ambivalent attitude, and asserted the existence of an "instinct of aversion." To that the present reviewer—while, as Mr. Westermarck remarks, strengthening his position—objected that there was no need to assume any such instinct, since the phenomenon in question is merely the negative aspect of the positive facts of sexual attraction, only appearing as a pronounced "aversion" when it is definitely presented to the mind, and not instinctively.

Now Mr. Westermarck drops the assumption of an "instinct of aversion," and therewith the only serious objections to his position fall away, though it is possible that he may even yet put the matter a little more clearly and positively, a little less negatively. He refers to a boy in Finland who made a distinction between the girls of his own school and other girls, the latter only being what he termed "real" girls. That boy was quite correct. There is no "aversion" from the women of one's own group—far from it. But only the girl with whom one has not grown up from childhood, and become accustomed to, can ever be to us, in the truly sexual sense, a "real" girl. That is to say, she alone can possess those powerful stimuli to the sense of sexual desirability, never developed in the people one has grown unconsciously used to, which are essential to the making of a "real" girl. All this is bound up with the essential facts of sexual psychology in Man and lower animals alike, and there is good biological reason why it should be. How much Mr. Westermarck gained by abandoning the "instinct of aversion" may be seen by the remarks of Freud, completely rejecting his original theory, which he here quotes. Freud states, quite truly, that psychoanalytically it is impossible to accept an "innate aversion" to incestuous feeling. That rejection is no longer to the point; the Westermarckian view, as now stated, becomes even more coherent than the Freudian, for Freud regards the infantile incestuous tendencies to which he attaches importance as violently repressed in later childhood, but it is far more plausible to argue that, in the healthily born, they die out naturally and normally under the usure of familiar life. Mr. Westermarck might have pointed out that, in our civilization, the occasional examples of truly passionate incestuous attraction which arise are nearly always between those persons who have been separated during the pubertal period, so that the dulling effect of familiar life on the development of sexual stimuli has been suspended. It is the simple, fundamental impulses of normal life which all our customs and institutions and laws formulate and often emphasize. Human ingenuity sometimes molds them into extravagant shapes and camouflages them with fantastic designs, but it is the fundamental natural impulses beneath them which are the driving force.

This is what Mr. Westermarck in general clearly sees. He is thus easily able to refute Sir James Frazer's rejection of his view. Frazer thinks that laws exist to forbid men to do the things their natural instincts incline them to do! Laws, it seems, are brought down to men, by the Mosaic method, from some inaccessible Sinai. Strange that so brilliant an investigator, whose researches have often elucidated superstitions, should himself fall a victim to a superstition so gross!

There is a temptation, before this great and fascinating "History," to linger over the problems the author seeks so carefully and learnedly to solve. It is indeed a varied panorama which is here spread before us. One never ceases to marvel over the endless modifications and elaborations and complexities into which the romantic and mighty human mind has successfully molded even so apparently simple and fundamental a biological fact as that of marriage. One cannot help wondering, also, what new and fantastic shapes await our marriage system in the future. For Man never stands still. When he begins to stand still he is dying. Yet, we may be sure, the more marriage changes in form the more obviously it will in substance remain the same thing.

HAVELOCK ELLIS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Great American

Life and Letters of Henry Lee Higginson. By Bliss Perry. The Atlantic Monthly Press. $4.

IF one should seek to tell the story of the United States from 1850 to the present day in the biographies of a dozen Americans, this excellent and, in places, genuinely moving, life of Major Higginson would inevitably be among them. For, if unusually distinguished, the man's career was typical of much that was finest in the life of New England during the Civil War and after. Indeed, the whole story of the development of the Eastern United States from the simple anti-slavery period to the highly complicated modern civilization of a great country which bears so little resemblance to the Massachusetts of Major Higginson's boyhood is here to be found, visualized through his manifold activities, his keen interest in many phases of life, and his boundless benefactions, notably to Harvard. It is a subject so full of profound significance, so replete with dramatic incident as well, that the wonder is that no novelist or dramatist, not even Howells, has sought to work so rich a vein as is to be found in the lives of many of our Eastern captains of finance and industry.

Particularly alluring is the study of what the men who fought in the Civil War later made of themselves. Major Higginson, an excellent though by no means distinguished officer, belonged to the finest group of Northern young men who risked their lives to uphold the Union. Six of his most intimate friends perished, and others, like himself, bore the marks of the enemy to the end of their days. They took into the conflict a selflessness and devotion quite unsurpassed, and then, such as survived, laid down their arms promptly to begin life anew. Major Higginson, like many another, essayed cotton-planting in the far South, only to fail. Thereupon he entered the firm of Lee, Higginson & Co., whose history from then on is his own. Under his leadership it became one of the great banking-houses of the country and as such it took a large part in the tremendous industrial expansion and the opening up of the West which transformed America from a set of provincial communities into a great world power. There is practically no phase of that amazing development in which Major Higginson did not share—the railroads, the shoe machinery, the telephone, the telegraph, the electric light and power, the street railways and railroads; in each and all of these he amassed the wealth which he so lavishly and freely bestowed. Music in America, of course, owes an inextinguishable debt to the founder of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

Now others whose lives were cast in this mold have become bounders, gamblers, exploiters, profiteers, and shameless masters of special privilege. A tremendously strong character, a deep sense of civic responsibility, a recognition that nobility obliges, and a profound clinging to the ideals and traditions of the past kept Major Higginson personally clean and kind of heart. He had much of the Puritan in him; certainly he held himself in control with rigidity and wore an outward mask of severity which concealed a warmth of devotion in friendship, a loyalty to those who had won his affection, and a romance unusual in men of affairs. It is undeniable, however, that in the latter years of his life he was out of step with the tendencies of the day. Professor Perry has delicately brought out Major Higginson's defense of the great capitalists and big business men, which defense proves that in a business way he outlived his generation, as it also shows that no man could wield his great power and carry on his manner of business without being adversely affected by it. That he took an interest in labor there is not a line to show; all the Rooseveltian legislation against trusts and railroads he bitterly opposed. He could not adjust himself to the new concepts as to wealth and privilege, to the ideal of service in business rather than profit, which the present hour has brought to the front.

Upon the story of the Boston Symphony with its tragic ending Mr. Perry throws some much needed light; the passion and hysteria of the war, together with the fact that in Dr. Muck underneath the brilliant conductor there was concealed a personal rascality nobody suspected, broke down that glorious orchestra and exhausted and nearly broke Major Higginson himself. Indeed, the World War, as Mr. Perry lets us see, staggered and bewildered him like so many others. It made no appeal to his finer nature. Instead he threw himself into the preparedness movement, demanding in 1916 an army of 500,000 "for service anywhere, whether on land or on the water and thus let Mexico see we are in earnest"—very different from the volunteer of 1864 who wanted to fly to the aid of Mexico and expel the French from her soil and the man who in 1899 opposed our imperialism in the Philippines. He was among the first to be eager for war with Germany and quite content with its outcome, not apparently looking beyond the collapse of the German militarism which he had, as a boy student in Dresden, learned to hate.

All in all, Mr. Perry's presentation of Major Higginson's career is entirely admirable and done with the literary skill we have the right to expect of him. Yet his method of depicting his subject by ceaseless quotations has its drawbacks. If he has let Major Higginson tell a large part of his own story, one misses that appraisement and moral valuation of the subject's career and services which add so much to the worth and teaching of the great biographies.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Consumerism vs. Commercialism

Modern Economic Tendencies. By Sidney A. Reeve. E. P. Dutton and Company. $12.

THE inevitable revolution will be one not of the workers but of the Ultimate Consumers. The crisis will come through the paralysis of public purchasing power, due to the expanding costs of competition and the burden of interest charges. Widespread unemployment will be followed by a sudden collapse of world-credit. Upon a few days' notice factories and railways will stop running and in the cities there will be swift famine and anarchy. Then must follow the organization of Consumerism.

Such is the series of predictions which Sidney A. Reeve bases upon his review of the economic evolution of America. His huge pamphlet, 850 pages long, perhaps because it was eight years in the writing, is badly arranged, turgid, and twice as long as necessary. In spite of these faults—important because they partly obscure the author's message—the book is so suggestive that it seems the function of the reviewer not to write his own comments but to report these results of a lifetime of study as fairly as space will allow. In what follows, even where quotation marks do not appear, the thought is that of Mr. Reeve, not of the reviewer.

Commercialism is growing more rapidly than any other factor in our civilization. It is the uncontrollably increasing cost of doing business, not the increasing wealth of the few, which is poisoning our economic system. There is a tidal drift of workers from productive occupations into the more lucrative fields of commercial combat. Between the census of 1870 and that of 1910 the number of persons engaged in commercial activity increased 240 per cent, while those engaged in supplying food and clothing decreased 35 per cent. Those occupations which Mr. Reeve classes as "directly combative," such as salesmen, increased 426 per cent. Prices are rising because of this crowding into every line of trade of great numbers of competing sellers. We have "too many middlemen in parallel." Of every dollar spent by the consumer today, only 49.6 cents goes for the costs of producing what he buys. The other 50.4 cents pays for commercial combat.

The "law of supply and demand" does not operate except upon the relative price of a single commodity. Prices as a whole pay no attention to it. In spite of the drift away from productive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occupations, labor-saving appliances have provided a constant increase in the per-capita supply of life-support. Yet during the period of the most marked increase in food-supply per capita, we have had the greatest rise in food prices.

"The explanation of all this lies in the artificial distortion which is given to both supply and demand by commercialism. In the commercial world *it is never the supply of the real producer which is balanced against the consumer's demand; it is that of the retail commercialist instead.* In no case is the demand which reaches the producer that put forth by the Ultimate Consumer; it is that of the commercialist-employer, instead; and he passes on to the producer a mere fraction of the price paid by the consumer."

Interest and dividends are charged with a large part of the cost of commercialism. An investment is a forestalling of a public need. In making it, the investor takes a speculative risk, for which, in the common doctrine, he deserves reward if he has correctly foreseen what the public will want to buy. But no civilized community should permit any individual to assume such a risk or to profit by it, any more than we longer permit privateers to take a profitable part in warfare.

Fully 95 per cent of all modern capital, by Mr. Reeve's estimate, consists not of "stored-up labor," not of wages saved and invested, but of reinvested profits, interest, dividends, and surplus. For illustration, the members of the underwriting syndicate which formed the United States Steel Corporation in 1901 paid in $25,000,000, which sum was repaid to them in full through dividends during the first year. The entire worth of the Steel Corporation thenceforward—according to Mr. Carnegie's figures it was at least $1,500,000,000 by 1919—represents money "confiscated" from the consumer in the form of high prices. Upon this vast sum the consumer must continue to pay interest indefinitely.

The doctrine that interest must be based upon an original investment in stock and appliances has ceased to be even a pretense. It is now a frequent practice to issue common stock "of no par value." What the purchaser of such stock buys is only a share in the profits which the corporation may be able to obtain from the consumer. "Every existing dollar's worth of paper-title to commercial property in railroads, mills, factories, warehouses, dwellings, department-stores and petty retail shops alike has all been built up, as the decades passed, by this gradual but forcible annexation of the Ultimate Consumer's surplus —the surplus over all natural, actual, or even commercial return in commodities or service—in the name of and as the property of the seller. . . .

"The author challenges any business man to deny that, if he were employed upon an adequate salary to conduct all the trade of the land in his own line, protected in an absolute monopoly, yet not allowed to make profits—freed from the worries of competition, enjoying supplies brought to him in the same efficient manner, and employing labor fed in the same equitable way—he would not prefer it personally, would not be able to give cheaper, better standardized service than now, and would not find opportunity and motive for more rapid progress than now."

Orthodox socialism and trades unionism are rejected by Mr. Reeve, because they take no account of the modern problem of distribution and the necessity of economic credit, and because the forcing up of the wage merely results in the more rapid rise of prices.

Upon the small investor and the young business man, rather than upon the wage-worker, he builds his hopes for the "consumeration" which must replace the commercial system of distributing life-support. The small investor must come to see that any interest-rate as small as 6 per cent is a dead loss. Prices increase so rapidly that it is more thrifty to spend the dollar than to save it. Business men must learn that they make a bad bargain when they struggle for control in one industry, while abandoning to other commercialists their own rightful share in the ownership and enjoyment of every other property.

Commercialism is obsolete, inefficient, and unjust, and must be replaced by economic democracy formed "somehow" upon the natural sovereignty of the Ultimate Consumer. Mr. Reeve has no method of procedure to lay down. He does, however, outline the following principles upon which Consumerism must be based: (1) The Ultimate Consumers will own all plant and stock, all producers working for public service at a publicly known wage or salary; (2) purchases will never be solicited; (3) no interest, dividends, or rent will be paid; (4) profits will never be divided, but will be used to expand facilities, accumulate stocks, or cover variations in the market or supply; (5) government will involve only questions of general policy.

The immediate need is a wider discussion of the imminent dangers of commercialism—a discussion for which the professional economists have failed to prepare us.

It is the commercialists who are pushing us toward the crisis. Only the commercialists can lessen its evil consequences. And unfortunately Mr. Reeve's book is hardly of the kind which will be widely read among a class addicted to *Babson's Reports* and the *American Magazine.*

RICHARD J. WALSH

Heart of Africa

Batouala. By René Maran. Paris: Albin Michel. 3 fr. 75.

THIS novel by a Negro, to which was awarded the 1921 Goncourt Prize in France, is called by the publisher a "véritable roman nègre." But it is more than that. It is another of those successful ventures into the arts by which the modern Negro is managing to make himself heard above the melee in increasing numbers. It is a sign that as he grows in racial self-consciousness and pride, under the sting of white incomprehension and oppression, he can successfully employ literature as a means not only of "self-expression" but of race-expression.

It is easy to read into the work of an exotic author too much exotic atmosphere, but in this case the Paris publisher was justified in calling this Negro romance *véritable.* It could not have been written by a man of any other blood.

Anyone even superficially acquainted with the Negro as he reveals himself in America can detect in "Batouala" true Negro humor, with the authentic Negro quaintness; but more Negro still is the use of and delight in color. Sometimes it is rather dragged in for its own sake, though not to the novel's harm. It is laid on with an exulting brush—tropical, luxuriant. The strokes are broad, the contrasts bold. Reading "Batouala," one is bound to recall examples of African art with its gusto for primary colors, its careless strength.

And the book is fiercely, though naively, animal. The senses flourish and expand: sound, taste, sight, smell. M. Maran sees to it that we eat tremendous dishes to repletion; hear the tom-tom's excitations; see the heat waves quivering on hill and plain; and smell goats, dogs, sweat, and excrement. Such, he asserts, is Equatorial Africa. If you have taken a dislike to him as guide, you had better turn back. Africa, especially that part under French administration, is, according to him, no place for the delicate. Batouala is the name of a great chief, the *mokoundji* of many villages. He is the hero. But in Africa at least, it seems, no husband is a hero to his wife. Yassiguindja, the wench, deceives him without shame, compounding iniquity with his enemy, Bissibingui. How Batouala meant to kill them both and why he failed comprises the novel, if novel you call it. The author makes no claim; he says the book is merely "une succession d'eaux-fortes."

What M. Maran thinks of the whites who govern his native country—or consume it, as he puts the matter—is evident. But he denies that his book is a polemic. "It does not accuse," he says; "it records." His preface, however, does not escape bitterness. Of his people in decimated Oubangui-Chari he remarks: "If they die of hunger by thousands, like flies, it is only because one is developing their country"; and again: "They suffer but laugh that they suffer."

PHILLIPS RUSSELL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

Shaw and the Theater

THE Theater Guild's production of Bernard Shaw's "Back to Methuselah" in a cycle of three performances reminds one of that heroic period of the Attic stage when trilogies or even tetralogies concerning the nature of men and of the gods themselves were held to be the natural modes of theatric expression. Such, too, was the spirit and purport of the cyclic mysteries of the medieval theater. And every play, indeed, even the most naturalistic transcript from life, is a mystery play and deals, through the symbolism of the concrete, with the ultimate questions that confront the human mind. The popular theater is so bad and so immoral not because it is popular, but because it is so cowardly and so trivial and seeks to alienate the drama from its grave, permanent, and natural function. We are neither Greeks nor Medievals. We cannot discuss the universe in terms of wonders and theodicies; we must discuss it in terms of scientific and philosophical ideas. Goethe knew that and, knowing it, wrote "Faust," the greatest of modern mystery plays; Shaw knows it and has written "Man and Superman" and "Back to Methuselah." Here we have on the stage once more God and man and the universe. The names are different; the conceptual machinery is as different from the old as a high-power automobile is from an ox-cart; the subject is the same essentially changeless one; the eternal theater has come home to itself.

To appreciate the magnificence of this fact is not to identify oneself uncritically with that metabiological doctrine which Shaw preaches. He has not abandoned the ratiocinative processes wholly for the creative imagination; he seeks a *via media* out of the chaos and tragedy of things. Thus he reveals finally, not like the author of "Faust," an aspect of mortality so implicated in the nature of things that it can never be denied, however resisted or repudiated, but a curious speculation that every tyro in a given field of knowledge can reduce to the absurd. And he does so in the service of an ultimate trend which the tradition in the minds of men will approve and their hourly practice negate. He projects the moral dualism of Paul into a cosmos scientifically conceived and turns that cosmos into a vast Protestant meeting-house in which the body of this death is sloughed off like a snake's skin and the soul is saved.

It matters little. The man is greater than his doctrine and the artist, after all, happily more powerful than the Neo-Lamarckian. Those are to be envied who read neither the book nor the preface to the book but see the five plays and receive, without any cold clarification of its ideas, the impact of the concrete and imaginative power of "Methuselah." That power is brought out strongly by the production—an undertaking which, whether one considers the artistic courage and the economic risk or the intricacy of the problems of theatric craftsmanship involved, is clearly unparalleled in the history of the English-speaking stage.

On the first of the three evenings the Guild produced "In the Beginning" and "The Gospel of the Brothers Barnabas." The mixed character of "In the Beginning" made its projection a task of staggering difficulty. It is necessary to realize this difficulty to judge what has been done. Shaw's Garden of Eden is mystical and primitive on the one hand; on the other he has not been content to lend it merely the implications of a symbol. It had to serve as the exposition of an almost rigid intellectualistic system. Since, furthermore, he desired to make that system applicable to the whole temporal range of human life, Adam and Eve and Cain are not only primitive and mythical and symbolical but also contemporary. The beautiful figures of George Gaul and Ernita Lascelles may have struck one as too little massive and earth-rooted for one aspect of Shaw's conception. But every aspect having to be somehow expressed, the slight emphasis on youth and plastic charm was necessary in the first act. The second suffers a little under this previous necessity. Even here, however, fearing to give Eve a conventional grandeur, Shaw makes the mother of mankind both a feminist and a flirt. She is Penelope; she is also Circe. Thus one concludes that the embodiment used is not only beautiful but fit. No doubt disturbs one's acceptance of Margaret Wycherly's Voice of the Serpent or the two sets of Lee Simonson—the first pure vision, the second a blending of creative vision with the necessary realities of life and gear that began to fill the already aging earth.

The production of "The Gospel of the Brothers Barnabas" is an unclouded triumph. Here is a conversation of nearly two hours in which there is neither action, conflict, nor, in any conventional dramaturgic sense, crisis. Yet that conversation is exciting, dramatically exciting beyond all external passion, adventure, murder, or sudden death. And it is so because it deals superbly with the fundamental ideas and traits from which all action springs. The work of the actors here is very nearly flawless, that of A. P. Kaye of an astonishing felicity, ease, and exactness. I suspect, however, that a major share of the credit belongs to the directors, Alice Lewisohn and Agnes Morgan. The vital question was the question of rhythm. One moment of slackness or of uncertainty or one of shambling or haste would have ripped the texture and destroyed the illusion. No such moment occurred. The audience sat through two hours of sheer conversation and learned, by an intense experience, to recognize what the essence of the art of the drama really is.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

LECTURES *and* AMUSEMENTS

A Shaw Festival
BACK TO METHUSELAH
In Three Productions
Seats on sale for second cycle beginning March 20th
Prices for the cycle of three performances
Evenings: Orchestra, $9.90, 1st Balcony, $8.25, $6.60, $4.95, and $3.30
GARRICK THEATRE 65 WEST 35th STREET

Concert by
THE NEW YORK TRIO
Monday, March 13, 8:40 p. m.
at the
Rand School, 7 E. 15th Street
Admission 35 cents

The Fifth Avenue Restaurant
Under the personal management of Theodore Kemm, Proprietor
Fifth Avenue Building
Madison Square, New York City

A Luncheon Resort of the finest in the heart of the business district.

Evening service for group dinners only.

Especially adapted for Dinner-Meetings of Civic, Political, Fraternal and Business Organizations

Reasonable Rates *Seating Capacity 1200*

THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, Private Property and the State, by FREDERICK ENGELS is the most widely read and authoritative work on the subject. The application of the facts to these times shows not only which way we are headed, but which way we must go.
New cloth edition, just off the press; price reduced to 60c postpaid. Catalog free.
Charles H. Kerr & Co., 347 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Samoa and the United States

THE Samoan policy of the United States, discussed in an article on Our Naval Autocracy in Samoa printed on another page of this issue of *The Nation*, has aroused controversy in this country and on the islands themselves. Certain documents which bear on the matter and which are referred to by Mr. Ripley in his article are printed below. Others, relating to the question of American sovereignty over Samoa, including a statement on the question of Mr. Hannum's charges from Mr. Denby, the Secretary of the Navy, the treaties entered into by the United States with regard to Samoa, and excerpts from the report for the current year of the Governor of American Samoa, will be published in a later issue.

American Law and Order

NATIVE agitation of even an orderly nature is by the terms of this law made illegal. Even the protests against American naval rule published in the pages following would probably endanger the safety of the authors and signers.

REGULATION CONCERNING OFFENSES AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GOVERNOR OF AMERICAN SAMOA, as follows:

1. If two or more persons conspire to overthrow, put down, or destroy by force the Government of the United States or the Government of American Samoa, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any of the laws of the United States or American Samoa, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the Government of the United States or the Government of American Samoa, contrary to the authority thereof, they shall be fined not more than $2,500.00, or imprisoned not less than five years or more than twenty years, or both.

2. Any person who shall by any act or words excite, or attempt to excite, *disloyalty* against the Government of the United States, or against the Government of American Samoa, or who shall excite, or attempt to excite, such hostility or ill-will between different classes of the inhabitants of American Samoa as may be injurious to the public welfare, or who shall incite, encourage, or procure, or attempt to incite, encourage, or procure lawlessness, violence, or disorder in American Samoa, shall be fined not more than $2,000.00, or imprisoned not less than four years or more than sixteen years, or both.

3. If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the laws of the United States, the laws of American Samoa, and the Samoan customs, or because of his having so exercised the same, they shall be fined not more than $1,500.00, or imprisoned not less than three years or more than twelve years, or both.

4. If any Samoan chief, by reason of his rank or title, shall injure, oppress, threaten, subject to indignities, or intimidate any citizen of American Samoa in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the laws of the United States, the laws of American Samoa and the Samoan customs, or because of his having so exercised the same, he shall be fined not more than $500.00, or imprisoned not less than two years or more than eight years, or both.

5. Any person who shall be guilty of any disobedience or resistance to, or any attempt to weaken the authority of, or prevent the execution of any lawful order of, the Governor, the Secretary of Native Affairs, district governor, district judge, county chief, village chief, magistrate, or any other lawful official of the Government of American Samoa, or who shall interfere with any of said officials in the proper discharge of their duties, shall be fined not more than $300.00, or imprisoned not less than one year, or more than four years, or both.

6. This Regulation shall take effect and come into force the 4th day of January, 1921.

Published and Exhibited at the Government Offices this, the 4th day of January, 1921.

WALDO EVANS, Governor

Samoan Grievances

THE summary of Samoa's grievances appearing below was compiled by Samuel S. Ripley, author of the article on Our Naval Autocracy in Samoa, and addressed by him to the President of the United States. The charges included in this document were made by Samoans, and in its final form the summary was submitted to an official committee of Samoan chiefs who gave it their sanction and selected Mr. Ripley as their authorized representative in matters arising between Samoa and the United States.

That the naval officials rendered no account to the Samoan chiefs or people of the money collected from taxes, levied by naval officials upon the property of the inhabitants of the Samoan Islands, and poll taxes; that none of the money so collected had been expended in roads, beneficial to the people, nor in maintaining schools with suitable and efficient non-sectarian teachers, nor in the establishment of a system of internal improvements, nor in promoting agricultural, horticultural, or industrial enterprises, nor in the maintenance of efficient police regulations. That the majority of the naval officials displayed no interest in furthering the development of the islands and the advancement of the inhabitants. That no accounts of the disposition of the money collected by taxes levied during the naval administration had been published in the Samoan language, or otherwise made known to the chiefs and people, who had no knowledge or information, or means of acquiring knowledge or information respecting the disposition made of the money collected from native taxes, including poll taxes.

That the naval officials failed to establish and enforce a suitable and effective school system, or to provide suitable and efficient non-sectarian teachers to instruct Samoan children, culturally or vocationally, or in the English language, or in the form or system of government of the United States, and even failed to enforce educational regulations enacted by the Naval Commandant, as set forth in a so-called Codification of Naval Regulations, Laws, and Orders. That British textbooks were used in the schools and ideals inimical to American institutions were being inculcated upon the minds of the growing generation. That untrained and inexperienced teachers were employed, some of whom were unable to teach or speak the English language correctly. That in the town of Ieone, the place containing the largest native population on the islands, there was no public school building, and the children of school age were compelled by some order or regulation made by the Commandant to attend sectarian schools and were instructed by sectarian teachers, notwithstanding that the so-called Codification of Naval Regulations, Laws, and Orders especially provided for an elementary education on a vernacular basis, an intermediate education on an American basis, and a secondary education, including manual training and instruction in agriculture, and further provided for the building and maintenance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of school buildings and suitable houses for teachers, with suitable tracts of land immediately around school buildings for playgrounds and for agricultural experiment stations for the students of the schools, and as gardens for the teachers. (In view of the fact that no attempt had been made to carry out these, as well as other, provisions of the codification, and to use the money collected from Samoan taxes to put said provisions into effect, it may be safely assumed that these were incorporated in the codification for the sole and only purpose of conveying the impression that the naval authorities were interested in the education and advancement of the Samoan people; however, they preferred to absorb the Samoan tax funds in payment of unearned salaries to useless appointees.)

That the only substantial road constructed by the naval officials consisted of a concrete road built within the naval station proper, which was of no value or service to the inhabitants of the islands.

That no attempt has been made to instruct the people or the growing generation in horticultural or agricultural development, or vocationally, or to encourage the development of the natural resources of the islands. That no attempt has been made to drain the lowlands as in other tropical places under governmental supervision of the United States to eradicate the mosquito pest (which eminent physicians familiar with the conditions in Samoa claim is the source of the spread and propagation of the very prevalent scourge of elephantiasis).

That no baseline had been established, so that the lands could be surveyed and the lines between respective owners definitely established.

That young Samoan women and girls had been violated by naval officials and appointees, in direct violation of the penal regulations, and no attempt had been made to punish the offenders.

That the immoral practices and personal conduct of many of the naval officials and their appointees tended to and did degrade and lower the morals of the growing generation of the islands, and destroyed all respect and confidence in them, not only by the Samoan chiefs, but by the Samoan people generally, and caused the Samoans to become distrustful of the naval officials and appointees and of the good intentions of the United States Government.

That the courts, secretaries, and clerks of the several naval departments of the islands had been and were dominated and controlled by persons who were exploiting the islands and the Samoan people for personal gain; that appeals, made to the Commandant to right the wrongs so inflicted and prevent others from being committed against the Samoan people, were totally disregarded and of no avail, notwithstanding that the chiefs of the islands had frequently appealed for justice, fair dealing, and morality.

That the then Commandant of the navy, stationed at Samoa, ordered meetings of the hereditary chiefs, duly assembled to discuss the affairs of the several districts in accordance with Samoan laws and customs and in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Codification, to disband and forbade them to hold any other hereditary chiefs' meetings.

That the then Naval Commandant, having full knowledge of the wrongs, injustice, and immoral practices that had been perpetrated upon the Samoan people, ordered armed guards to suppress meetings of the chiefs, who had lawfully and peacefully assembled to consider the grievances of their people and to prepare an appeal to the President of the United States to obtain redress (obviously arrogating to himself supreme authority on the islands and disregarding any rights that the United States Government—in distinction from the Navy Department—may have on the islands, as well as the Samoan Government, which has been recognized by the United States Government in solemn treaties, and totally disregarding the inherent rights and feelings of the Samoan people and the established policy and laws of the United States respecting the rights of all people under its jurisdiction). . . .

From the "Loyal" Chiefs

THE following letter to the President and the Secretary of the Navy from thirty-nine Samoan chiefs repudiates the statements made in Mr. Ripley's document, printed above.

PROCLAMATION

The Declaration addressed to the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States printed herewith was written and signed by the Samoan Chiefs, whose names appear below, of their own free will at Fagatogo, Tutuila, American Samoa, on July the twenty-seventh, the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one. This Declaration is printed herewith for the information of the people of American Samoa.

W. EVANS, Governor of American Samoa

TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA,
PAGO PAGO, JULY 27, 1921

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY DEPARTMENT, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

YOUR EXCELLENCIES:

We, the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, and Chiefs of the American Samoan Islands, hereby extend to you our hearty greetings and salutations. We wish to express to Your Excellencies our great appreciation and our satisfaction with the administration of our political and financial affairs, which have been so well and graciously conducted under the direction of the United States Navy Department since the year 1900. We appreciate fully the many things that have been done for us during this period, and the kindness of the officers that have been sent here to govern us. We are especially grateful for what the present Governor and his staff are now doing for us, and the great interest that they are showing in our welfare.

We are satisfied and pleased with all the decisions made by the Board of Assessors appointed to investigate matters which had been cause of misleading the minds of the chiefs of Samoa and in their attitude toward the Government in the year past.

We are entirely satisfied with the construction of the laws and the formation of the Government of American Samoa, from the beginning to the present time.

We accepted of our own full knowledge and consent to be guided under the Navy Department of the great Government of the United States of America. We agree that this form of administration be continued in the same manner as when the American flag was first hoisted over the Islands of Tutuila and Manua.

We have agreed with our full consent and knowledge that all decisions and deliberations by the chiefs during the year past be disregarded and forgotten. We also petition that all documents, petitions, and all other matters that may come before you, on behalf of the Samoan people, shall be disregarded, excepting only when such documents as this are properly indorsed by the representative chiefs of American Samoa and sent through the Governor of American Samoa.

We request herewith, with our full knowledge and consent, that the petition presented to you, signed by Sam Ripley, be disregarded in all its respects. We also wish to state that he is not one of the class of the hereditary ranking chiefs of Samoa.

Below, we, the representative chiefs of American Samoa attach our personal signatures to this petition, and each and every one of us offer to the Creator our earnest prayers for your health, happiness, and success, in the offices to which you have recently come.

Very respectfully,

(Names of thirty-nine chiefs)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Counter-Blast

THE letter from the thirty-nine chiefs supporting American rule in Samoa was immediately followed by another message signed by 344 chiefs, supporting Mr. Ripley's charges and repudiating the letter of the minority.

TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA,
PAGO PAGO, AUGUST 6, 1921

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THE HONORABLE, THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

SIRS: We, the High and Hereditary Chiefs and Talking Chiefs of American Samoa, being the duly constituted representatives of the great majority of the people of American Samoa and constituting the Samoan Government, greet your Excellencies most heartily. We unanimously beg to inform your Excellencies that as such representatives of the Samoan people, we strongly condemn, oppose, reject, and object to the petition, or rather proclamation, which was recently issued by the Commandant of American Samoa. In the aforesaid proclamation it is urged that everything we petitioned for in the petition addressed last year to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy, and everything we petitioned for in later documents up to the present time, be disregarded, stating that we are well satisfied with the government as now conducted here.

This is false and a lie; we, therefore, pray your Excellencies to pay no attention to that proclamation issued by Commandant W. Evans. But we urgently request you to consider and act upon the information and statement in Samuel Ripley's petition, since it is the true and genuine statement of the real Samoan chiefs constituting the Samoan Government. Samuel Ripley is our designated representative and interpreter, the only true and lawful attorney of us, the High and Hereditary Chiefs and Talking Chiefs of the Samoan Government, and we have previously given him full power and authority to represent us in the United States of America, either by his personal appearance or by his genuine signature affixed to any written documents of whatever kind or nature, relating or appertaining to the affairs of American Samoa, and we do here and now confirm and ratify all that he has heretofore done for the Samoan Government, and by these presents do ratify and confirm all that he shall do for the Samoan people and Government.

Having expressed our hopes for the future welfare, happiness, and well-being of the Samoan people in the communication signed by Samuel Ripley, and presented to your Excellencies, we beg of you to right the grievous wrongs and the injustice practiced upon us by certain officers and officials of your Navy.

The proclamation issued by the Commandant, as you will observe, contained the signatures of only a few chiefs. Many of these were formerly true to the interests of the Samoan people and Government and signed our former petition, addressed last year to the President and the Secretary of the Navy, but they have become discouraged and have been so intimidated by naval officers that they have given up hope. Others whose signatures are affixed to that proclamation were compelled by our present naval governor to sign his proclamation by threats and force.

There are a few improvements being undertaken here this year, one road is under construction, a few schoolhouses are in building, and there are some improvements in sanitation, showing how true the statements in Samuel Ripley's communication to you were, and we ask you to consider and act favorably upon all other matters in that communication you received from him, in which he set forth conditions as they exist, based upon actual facts and evidence furnished by the High and Hereditary Chiefs and Talking Chiefs who recently signed the proclamation issued by the Commandant.

We again ask your Excellencies and all who have any oversight of conditions in these Islands, to consider and act favorably upon the communications or papers addressed to you by Samuel Ripley, and we again confirm the power and authority previously given to him. To this, we, the majority of the High and Hereditary Chiefs and the Talking Chiefs of American Samoa, constituting the Samoan Government, affix our signatures, according to the villages in which we reside.

Respectfully, (Names of 344 chiefs)

Kind Words from the United States

IGNORING the protests of the 344 Samoan chiefs, the Secretary of the Navy and the President dispatched the following messages to the "High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, and Chiefs" of American Samoa in answer to the representations of friendship contained in the repudiated letter of the thirty-nine chiefs, transmitted by Captain Evans.

PROCLAMATION

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
PAGO PAGO
AMERICAN SAMOA
November 22, 1921

The following letters from the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy, addressed to the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, Chiefs, and Samoan people, transmitted to them through the Governor, are herewith published.

These letters from the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy are in reply to the petition drawn up by the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, and Chiefs of American Samoa at the Government House, Pago Pago, July 27, 1921, and transmitted by them through the Governor to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy.

W. EVANS, Captain United States Navy,
Governor

FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

TO THE HIGH CHIEFS, TALKING CHIEFS, AND CHIEFS OF THE AMERICAN SAMOA ISLANDS

GREETINGS:

We are highly pleased to receive your greetings and salutations conveyed to us by your honorable Governor.

We appreciate especially your expressions of satisfaction and contentment with the form of government and the construction and administration of the laws of American Samoa and the interest of the Government in the material and spiritual welfare of yourselves and your people.

We are proud and gratified to note your realization of the good faith of the Government of American Samoa and of the Navy Department of the United States and to learn directly from you, in a document of great importance signed by your own hands, of your full consent to and acceptance of governmental guidance by the Navy Department of the United States; and further to learn that the unrest and agitation of last year should be and have been relegated to the dust-bin of forgotten things.

We congratulate you on your conserved health and returning prosperity, and renew our greetings and assurances to you, the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, and Chiefs, and through you, to the people of American Samoa.

All of which we transmit to you through him who is at one and the same time your representative and our own, the Governor of American Samoa.

October 10, 1921 EDWIN DENBY

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TO THE HIGH CHIEFS, TALKING CHIEFS, CHIEFS, AND PEOPLE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

GREETINGS:

With pleasure I have received and read your salutatory epistle carrying your heartfelt sentiments of trust and loyalty.

With particular interest I observe that your letter is couched

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The only true history is that little scrap of our own time which we can tell because we see it and feel it and know it. Definitive truth is already a dead truth and written history a cemetery."

AFTER THE WAR

London—Paris—Rome—Athens—Prague—Vienna—Budapest—Bucharest—Berlin—Sofia—Coblenz—New York—Washington

Colonel Repington

Better than any description the extracts below give the flavor of this continuation of the famous diary, of which one critic said: "Years hence it will be quoted as Evelyn and Pepys are quoted."

DIPLOMACY

Lord Hardinge told me the story of his successful intervention here in the Anglo-French dispute. He had been in England on three weeks' leave, and on July 27 was asleep in his garden at 3 P. M., when his butler announced that Lord Curzon wanted him on the telephone. He went in and C. told him that a break with France was imminent and that both sides were talking in such a strain as to render a rupture almost inevitable. The French were set on sending another French division to Upper Silesia and were prepared to act without a Supreme Council if we opposed them. C. then asked H. to come up to London at once to talk it all over with him, and to go over to Paris with a despatch for Briand. H. duly arrived in London at 7 P. M. and at once saw Curzon. After taking stock, H. said that there was no cause for alarm; that he felt sure that he could settle the whole dispute with Briand in twenty-four hours. He added that all, of course, depended on the instructions which he received, but if they were moderate he might pull through. He left next morning for Paris. The instructions followed him, and he spent two hours reading them and converting them into French before he saw Briand. He had also thought of a formula to help Briand out, and thought that it was more a face-saving business than anything else.

When he saw Briand, he attacked him at once. "Well, you are nice people to let me go away and then send bombshells to London. Of course if you *want* a break you can have one. *We* are not going to allow a new French division to go to Silesia—if you do not continue on the Supreme Council *we shall*"—and so on. Then he read his instructions, which were moderately worded, and presented his formula. Briand accepted the formula and said that he preferred to put it forward as his own to his Cabinet. Which he did, and they accepted it unanimously, while our Cabinet at home accepted too, and H. got home again for the conclusion of his holiday.

"Of all the lower animals of creation, the politician is the most ineffective.

"Secretary Hughes sunk in thirty-five minutes more ships than all the admirals of the world have destroyed in a cycle of centuries.

"Granville (the British Minister at Athens) said it was quite true that the Greeks were fighting the Turks at our instance.

"Clemenceau was asked how he felt after his operation for appendicitis. 'Quite well,' replied the Tiger. 'There are only two perfectly useless things in the world. One is an appendix and the other is Poincaré!'

"Mr. Hughes said that the Conference itself was quite a tame affair, but when he read his clippings at night he was astonished at all that was being read into it and could scarcely sleep.

"New York has the effect upon me of meeting an ichthyosaurus in Berkeley Square. It is all amazing and gargantuan and I cannot imagine anyone wanting to live here.

"Admiral Sims, on being asked what the Supreme Council would do about the freedom of the seas, replied that he did not care so long as they did not interfere with mixed bathing.

"Jay thought that the best way of doing business was that of a certain American Minister at a Central American Capital. He went into his balcony with a police whistle and whistled once for the President, twice for the Foreign Minister, three times for the Minister of Commerce, and they came running round to him.

"Pétain thought that we should occupy and exploit the Rhineland, and if taking it over and taxing it were of no avail, we should send the whole German population over the Rhine and replace it by French 'mutilés de guerre.'"

THE TIGER IN HIS LAIR

Went off to see M. Clemenceau at his old address. The same old commonplace bourgeoise den, with the dark enclosed court all surrounded by other houses, and in the dining-room, where I waited for a few minutes, the same dirty old woodwork on the walls, crying for coats of paint, and the ordinary, almost lodging-house furniture, and the red carpet worn threadbare and in patches at the entrance. What a home for the man who won the greatest war in history! Clemenceau came out of his room to find me. He was in the same old clothes and with a black half-turban cap on his head, and an almost imperceptible bit more stiff in his gait. But directly we sat down, I saw that there was all the old fire, the alert brain, the rapid thought, the clear word, the penetrating sarcasm, in fact the old master who won the war and the tiger who destroyed so many Ministeries. I could not see a vestige of a failure of his intellectual powers, and the eyes danced and glared and flashed, and the fun came rolling out with the same old humor, witticism, and profound knowledge of character and human nature. . . . Are you leaving any records of this tremendous time, I asked. No, said C., he had said nothing, had written nothing, and was not going to. He took no interest in controversies about the past which was over. He had lived through the greatest period and had done his best. It was enough to contemplate in silence the grandeur of it all. He took pleasure in his disdain of all discussion over the past. He did not care what people thought or said. It was all one to him. He had succeeded.

Harding sees neither black nor white in a case, but only greys, and is a man of compromise who feels his way. . . . Hughes is a good lawyer, and will get up a case well. But, being a lawyer, he cannot think. You are either innocent or guilty.

Those who read for amusement will enjoy "After the War" for its wealth of anecdotes and gossip of great personages, but to those whose eye can penetrate the brilliant surface, it will come as nothing less than an incomparably expert inventory and appraisal of our whole contemporary civilization.

$5.00 at all bookstores

4 Park Street Boston **HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY** **16 East 40th Street New York**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in your own language and expressions and is signed by your own free and untrammeled hand.

With profound satisfaction I discern the note of restored confidence in your Government and of faith in the future development of your fair land under its administration.

With especial pride in our institutions I perceive and accept your willingness to continue in cooperation with and under the guiding hand of our Navy Department and the Governor who is both my personal coadjutor and our mutual representative.

With abiding faith in your honor and integrity; with sympathetic participation in your difficulties as well as in your successes; with genuine interest in your advancement; and with the hearty wish that you may in peace and quietness pass your days;

I renew my greetings to you, the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, Chiefs, and people of American Samoa.

October 10, 1921 WARREN G. HARDING

"To Whom it May Concern"

THE document printed below was received on December 28, 1921, by Mr. Ripley, who describes in his article the circumstances of its origin.

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, GREETING:

WHEREAS, Great dissatisfaction prevails and has for a long time prevailed among a very large majority of the High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, Chiefs, and people of Tutuila and Manua, Samoa, with the governmental policy adopted and followed by naval commandants detailed to the naval station, Tutuila, styling themselves governors, and assuming the power to enact and enforce laws, rules, and regulations for the Samoan Government and the Samoan people; and

WHEREAS, Numerous protests have heretofore been addressed to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy protesting against the governmental policy and autocratic rule of the Naval Commandant styling himself governor, which have been disregarded; and

WHEREAS, Many of the chiefs and people of Samoa have been and are now imprisoned, and others have been arrested and fined for protesting directly to the Naval Commandant against the governmental policy adopted and enforced; and

WHEREAS, The chiefs and people of Tutuila and Manua, Samoa, are forbidden to assemble to consider Samoan affairs and the welfare of the people and the growing generation, and to petition the President and Secretary of the Navy for redress by orders issued by the Commandant styling himself governor; and

WHEREAS, The only means we have of so doing is to appoint and commission some person to act for us and in our behalf in preparing and presenting to the President of the United States and Congress and the Secretary of the Navy our grievances and wishes respecting Samoan affairs;

Now, therefore, We, the undersigned High Chiefs, Talking Chiefs, Chiefs, and people of Tutuila and Manua, Samoa, hereby duly constitute, appoint, and commission Fanene and Soliai to act for us and each of us in all matters having to do with the political and governmental affairs of Tutuila and Manua, Samoa, with full power and authority, in our name and for us, individually and collectively, who have signed this document, to prepare and sign for us and with our own proper names all such documents and papers as may be requisite, necessary, and proper to present any and all matters having to do with the political and governmental affairs of the said Samoan Islands, and address the same to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, or any of the committees thereof, and the Secretary of the Navy, and such other Departments and Bureaus of the United States as may be necessary and proper, with full power and authority to employ counselors and attorneys-at-law and such other person or persons as they may deem best to aid and assist them in carrying out the powers and authority hereby conferred upon them, and in obtaining redress for wrongs committed against the Samoan people and relief from naval absolutism now controlling these Islands and the inhabitants thereof, and to enter into agreements to pay and pay a reasonable compensation to those whom they may employ to assist them.

Giving and Granting unto the said Fanene and Soliai full power and authority to do and perform all and every act and thing whatsoever requisite and necessary to be done in and about the premises as fully to all intents and purposes as we might or could do, if personally present and acting; and we and each of us hereby undertake to ratify, confirm, and approve everything which the said Fanene and Soliai or those whom they may employ to assist them under the power hereby conferred upon them shall do or purport to do in virtue of these presents. Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be construed or considered as revoking the power and authority heretofore conferred upon Samuel S. Ripley to act for and in behalf of the committee of Samoan chiefs; and we and each of us hereby ratify and confirm all that the said Samuel S. Ripley and C. S. Hannum, chosen by said Samuel S. Ripley and the committee of chiefs as the attorney for the committee of chiefs, have done and performed under the authority so conferred upon them by said committee of Samoan chiefs, and by the 344 chiefs signing a document dated August 6, 1921; and we and each of us hereby fully authorize and empower the said Samuel S. Ripley and the said C. S. Hannum to continue in the efforts undertaken by them in behalf of the Samoan Government and people; and we and each of us hereby authorize, empower, and direct the said Fanene and Soliai in exercising the power and authority hereby conferred upon them, to confer with and act with the said Samuel S. Ripley and the said C. S. Hannum, and such other person or persons as the said Samuel S. Ripley may suggest. In the event the said Fanene and Soliai be imprisoned or punished or otherwise prevented by the naval authorities on these Islands from carrying out the power and authority hereby conferred upon them, or for any other reason or cause are incapacitated from acting, or decline or refuse to act for any cause or reason whatsoever, then and in that event, we and each of us hereby constitute, appoint, and commission Samuel S. Ripley, of Richmond, California, to act for us and each of us, in any and all matters herein conferred upon Fanene and Soliai, as fully and completely to all intents and purposes as the said Fanene and Soliai might or could do under the power and authority conferred upon them by this document.

Being denied the right to assemble in numbers by orders of the Naval Commandant, we, IN WITNESS WHEREOF, have subscribed our names both to the Samoan original and to the English translation attached to and made a part thereof, when presented to us during the months of November and December, 1921, and January, 1922.

(Signed by 971 Samoans, including the 344 Chiefs, according to the villages in which they reside)

Contributors to This Issue

SAMUEL S. RIPLEY is the grandson of an American who established himself in Samoa and married a native. Mr. Ripley's father also married a Samoan but maintained his American citizenship as has Mr. Ripley himself.

EDWARD RICHARDS is a professional forester with headquarters in New York City.

HAVELOCK ELLIS is an Englishman who turned from the practice of medicine to scientific writing and whose books on the question of sex have given him world eminence.

The other contributors to this issue have written previously for *The Nation.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED